A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY - PART I

IDENTIFICATION DATA

eporting A.I.D. Unit:	B. Was Evaluation Scheduled In Current FY Annual Evaluation Plan?	C. Evaluation Timing
ion or AID/W Office USAID/BOLIVIA	Yes ☒ Slipped ☐ Ad Hoc ☐	Interim ☐ Final ☒
DP 3/94)	Evaluation Plan Submission Date: FY 93 Q 4	ExPost ☐ Other ☐

ctivity or Activities Evaluated (List the following information for project(s) or program(s) evaluated; If not applicable, list title and date of the evaluation repo

ject – No.	Project/Program Title	First PROAG or Equivalent (FY)	Most Recent PACD (Mo / Yr)	Planned LOP Cost (000)	Amount Obligated To Date (000
-0623	SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES PROJECT	91	9/95	500	500

ACTIONS

tion Decisions Approved By Mission or AID/W Office Director	Name of Officer Responsible for Action	Date Action to be Completed
Action(s) Required		
1) Determine role of Project Coordinator for follow-on project.		5/94
2) Decide level of collaboration with other organizations for follow-on project.	H. Diez de Medina	
3) Determine how counterpart contribution will be calculated for the follow-on project.	H. Diez de Medina	6/94
	H. Diez de Medina	6/94

Best Available Copy

APPROVALS

te Of Mission Or AID/W Office review Of Evaluation:

	(Month)	(Day)	(Year)
	2	2	94

pprovals of Evaluation Summary And Action Decisions:

	Project Program Officer	Representative of Borrower/Grantee	Evaluation Officer	Mission or AID/W Office Director
e (Typed)	Hector Diez de Medina*	*	Anne Beasley*	Carl Leonard*
ture	[signature] 2/1/94	*	[signature] Anne Beasley 2/16/94	[signature] 2/16/94

ABSTRACT

H. Evaluation Abstract (Do not exceed the space provided)

This report is the final evaluation of the Special Development Activities (SDA) Project No. 511-0623 which was authorized for $500,000 on June 26, 1991. The purpose of the project is to assist people in rural communities in remote areas of Bolivia to undertake self-help projects which have an immediate impact on their socal and economic welfare. Sub-projects address basic needs of poor people in health, education, and production. Communities provide counterpart contributions which complement the USAID funding provided under SDA. The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the impact of project activities and the effectiveness of implementation processes and strategies. Specific issues addressed include how well the project goal and purpose have been achieved, whether or not program objectives have been supported, how well the project has been implemented, and its impact on beneficiaries. The evaluation was carried out over thirty days in November and December 1993 and included interviews with beneficiaries, USAID personnel, and personnel of NGOs carrying out similar projects. It also included an in-depth review of projec documentation, including sub-project files.

This evaluation identified forty-four (this number rises to forty-five if one sub-project which was assigned two numbers by Controller's is counted as two) approved sub-projects which have been completed, are underway, pending, or were cancelled. Thirty-seven and a half percent of the sub-projects are in water, 20% are in school construction, 10% include both schools and water, 27.5% are income generating and 5 % are in other categories. Sub-projects are improving the socio-economic conditions in rural communities. Water systems reduce disease and increase efficiency. Remodelled or newly constructed schools provide better learning environments. Since school structures also include a room for the teacher, it is easier for communities to attract better teachers to their communities. Productive projects include training centers and better access to markets which help people to improve their incomes.

The average time to complete a sub-project from the date of the initial request to the date of project completion is 16.1 months. It is recommended to reduce this time, that inspection visits be carried out and counterpart be verified prior to sending sub-project proposals to the Project Committee for selection. The sub-projects are self-help in that communities provide counterpart contributions, unskilled labor, form implementation committees, and establish mechanisms for maintenance and repair. However, USAID staff is also providing substantial technical assistance and the Project Coordinator procures commodities on behalf of communities. Management must decide what level of technical assistance is appropriate for the follow-on project. These decisions will determine the role and the tasks of the Project Coordinator.

Lessons learned indicate that there may be trade-offs when a project has several purposes. For example, there may be a trade-off between giving communities freedom to design and implement their own projects, i.e. "self-help," and the achievement of USAID's concept of "immediate impact." The concept of "time" may be impacted by culture. There may be valid trade-offs between implementing well-executed, technically sound sub-projects which do, in fact, create good will towards the U.S. in rural communities, (an unstated purpose of the SDA project), and "self-help" which may imply less than optimally constructed projects, but less USAID technical assistance. Priorities should be assigned to each of these project purposes and these will help determine the parameters of the follow-on project.

Best Available Copy

COSTS

I. Evaluation Costs

Name	1. Evaluation Team Affiliation	Contract Number OR TDY Person Days	Contract Cost OR TDY Cost (U.S.$)	Source of Funds
Anne Beasley	USAID Eval. Officer	30 days	$7,500	Contract No. 511-0000-S-00-3403

2. Mission/Office Professional Staff Person-Days (Estimate) 18 days	3. Borrower / Grantee Professional Staff Person-Days (Estimate) 0

SUMMARY

J. Summary of Evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recomendations (Try not to exceed the three (3) pages provided)
  Address the following items:
  - Purpose of evaluation and methodology used
  - Purpose of activity(ies) evaluated
  - Findings and conclusions (relate to questions)
  - Principal recomendations
  - Lessons learned

Mission or Office : USAID/BOLIVIA	Date This Summary Prepared : January 14, 1994	Title and Date Of Full Evaluation Report: Final Evaluation of the Special Development Activitie: Project No. 511-0623

This report is the final evaluation of the **Special Development Activities (SDA) Project No. 511-0623** which was authorized for $500,000 on June 26, 1991. The purpose of the project is to assist people in rural communities in remote areas of Bolivia to undertake self-help projects which have an immediate impact on their social and economic welfare. Sub-projects address basic needs of poor people in health, education, and production. Communities provide counterpart contributions which complement the USAID funding provided under SDA. The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the impact of project activities and the effectiveness of implementation processes and strategies. Specific issues addressed include how well the project goal and purpose have been achieved, whether or not program objectives have been supported, how well the project has been implemented, and its impact on beneficiaries. Recommendations have been made that are applicable to a follow-on SDA project for which the Concept Paper has already been written and sent to Washington.

This evaluation identified forty-four (this number rises to forty-five if one sub-project which was assigned two numbers by Controller's is counted as two) approved sub-projects which have been completed, are underway, pending, or were cancelled. 37.5 percent of the sub-projects which were carried out are in water, 20% are school construction, 10% are dual and include both water systems and schools, 27.5% are income-generating productive projects and 5% are in other categories. The sub-projects are improving the socio-economic conditions in rural communities where they are being carried. Water systems reduce disease and increase efficiency. Remodelled or newly constructed schools provide better learning environments. Since these structures also include a room for the teacher, it is easier for communities to attract better teachers to their communities. Productive projects include training centers and better access to markets which help people to improve their incomes.

The average time to complete a sub-project is calcultated at 16.1 months, from the date of the initial request to completion. This process has been divided into two phases, the bureaucratic phase which extends from the initial community request to the date the sub-obligating document is signed, and the implementation phase during which the project is actually constructed. The average time for the bureaucratic phase is 12.1 months and that for implementation is reported as 4 months. These time periods are somewhat longer than the three months mentioned for implementation in the SDA Project Paper or one year which USAID staff believes should ideally cover the entire process. Nevertheless, it is expected that this time can be reduced considerably if inspection visits are carried out and counterpart contributions are verified prior to sending proposals to the Project Committee for selection.

The sub-projects are "self-help" in that communities do provide counterpart contributions, provide unskilled labor for construction projects, set up committees to carry out implementation, and establish mechanisms to provide for subsequent repairs. However, USAID staff is providing substantial technical assistance and the Project Coordinator procures commodities for construction projects on behalf of communities. Management must decide what level of technical assistance is appropriate for the follow-on project. These decisions will determine the role and tasks of the Project Coordinator.

Another recommendation is that the interaction of USAID and the Embassy be limited to the proposal selection stage and inaugurations at the completion of sub-projects. Under such a scenario, only USAID signatures would be required on the sub-obligating document, and USAID staff would be responsible for all monitoring and implementation activities as is the case in other projects.

The need for a computerized sub-project tracking system is evident as the current manual tracking system is cumbersome. The new system should include key dates of request letters, visits, signing of documents, project completion, and inaugurations.

Activities carried out under the SDA do contribute to improving the effectiveness and accessibility of key democratic institutions through enhancing the participation of rural communities in the decision-making process. Local institutions most frequently supported are the agrarian unions which are charged with identifying and finding solutions to problems facing communities. The SDA empowers these organizations to offer solutions which would not otherwise be available.

This evaluator discovered that one design flaw in the project is that planned counterpart contribution programmed for $167,000 33.4% of the total grant of $500,000 is too high and probably will not be achieved. This is because approximately half the gran

has been budgeted to cover USAID staff support costs. The Project Paper states that communities should contribute about 40% to the cost of sub-projects. Since only about $255,000 has been budgeted for sub-project commodities, 40% of this would onl reach $102,000, less than the minimum required by USAID handbook regulations for host country contribution (in this case $125,000 or 25% of the total grant). Accordingly, it is recommended that for the follow-on project, counterpart contribution as proportion of the total grant, should be reduced.

Lessons learned focus on the trade-offs which may be required when a project has several purposes. There may be a trade-off between giving communities freedom to design and implement their own projects, i.e. "self-help" and the achievement of USAID concept of "immediate-impact." The concept of "time" may be impacted by culture. Although many sub-projects took six months or longer to execute, community residents never complained about excessive implementation time. In accordance with "self-help" assumptions, communities set up their own work schedules. There may also be valid trade-offs between implementir well-executed, technically sound sub-projects which do, in fact, create good will towards the U.S. in rural communities, (an unstated purpose of the SDA project), and "self-help" which may imply less than optimally constructed projects, but less USAIC technical assistance. There are trade-offs in terms of USAID financial regulations and the requirements of the Controller's Office and the administrative costs of managing small sub-projects in which the purpose is "self-help." For example, the Controller's Office endorses the current procedure under which the Project Coordinator receives advances on the part of the communities, procures commodities, and cancels advances. However, this process may be inconsistent with "self-help" and one may conclud that communities should buy their own materials to construct their own projects. Management must consider compromises and trade-offs implicit in a project with several purposes and assign priorities to them. These priorities will help determine the parameters of the follow-on project.

Best Available Copy

ATTACHMENTS

K. Attachments (List attachments submitted with this Evaluation Summary, allways attach copy of full evaluation report, even if one was submitted earlier; attach studies, surveys, etc., from "on-going" evaluation, if relevant to the evaluation report.)

Final Evaluation of the Special Development Activities Project No. 511-0623

COMMENTS

L. Comments By Mission, AID/W Office and Borrower/Grantee On Full Report :

None

FINAL EVALUATION OF THE
SMALL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES PROJECT
NO. 511-0623

BY ANNE BEASLEY
JANUARY 10, 1994

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CANSAVE   Save the Children Canadá
CIFEMA   Centro de Investigación y Mecanización Agricola
DCM   Deputy Chief of Mission
DP   USAID Office of Development Programs
EOPS   End of Project Status
FH   Food for the Hungry
FIS   Fundación de Inversión Social
GTZ   Deutsche Gesellschaft fur Technische
LOP   Life of Project
NGO   Non governmental organization
PACD   Project Assistance Completion Date
SAR   USAID Semi-Annual Reports
SDA   Special Development Activities Project
TA   Technical Assistance
USAID   United States Agency for International Development
USIS   United States Information Service

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is the final evaluation of the **Special Development Activities (SDA) Project No. 511-0623** which was authorized for $500,000 on June 26, 1991. The purpose of the project is to assist people in rural communities in remote areas of Bolivia to undertake self-help projects which have an immediate impact on their social and economic welfare. Sub-projects address basic needs of poor people in health, education, and production. Communities provide counterpart contributions which complement the USAID funding provided under SDA. The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the impact of project activities and the effectiveness of implementation processes and strategies. Specific issues addressed include how well the project goal and purpose have been achieved, whether or not program objectives have been supported, how well the project has been implemented, and its impact on beneficiaries. Recommendations have been made that are applicable to a follow-on SDA project for which the Concept Paper has already been written and sent to Washington.

This evaluation identified forty-four approved sub-projects[1] which have been completed, are underway, pending, or were cancelled. Thirty-seven and a half percent of the sub-projects which were carried out are in water, 20% are school construction, 10% are dual and include both water systems or latrines and schools, 27.5% are income-generating productive projects and 5% are in other categories. The sub-projects are improving the socio-economic conditions in rural communities where they are being carried out. Water systems reduce disease and increase efficiency. Remodelled or newly constructed schools provide better learning environments. Since these structures also include a room for the teacher, it is easier for communities to attract better teachers to their communities. Productive projects include training centers and better access to markets which help people to improve their incomes.

The average time to complete a sub-project is calculated at 16.1 months, from the date of the initial request to completion. This process has been divided into two phases, the **bureaucratic phase** which extends from the initial community request to the date the sub-obligating or approval document is signed, and the **implementation phase** during which the project is actually constructed. The average time for the bureaucratic phase is 12.1 months and that for implementation is reported as 4 months. These

---

[1]An approved sub-project is one in which the sub-obligating document has been stamped by the USAID Controller's Office, has all required signatures, including that of the Ambassador, and has been assigned a project number by the Controller's Office. One sub-project, Tipas Kuchu was assigned two numbers by Controller's which would bring the total to forty-five. However, in this evaluation Tipas Kuchu is considered as one dual project. Since the classification system developed by the evaluator is slightly different than that used in the SARs, the figures are not identical.

time periods are a little longer than the three months mentioned for implementation in the Project Paper or one year which should ideally cover the entire process. Nevertheless, it is expected that this time could be reduced if sub-project files are completed prior to sending the proposals to the Project Committee for selection.

The sub-projects are "self-help" in that the communities do provide counterpart contributions, provide unskilled labor for construction projects, set up committees to carry out implementation, and establish mechanisms to provide for subsequent repairs. However, USAID staff is providing substantial technical assistance and the Project Coordinator procures commodities on behalf of the communities. Management must decide what level of technical assistance is appropriate for the follow-on project. These decisions will determine the role and tasks of the Project Coordinator.

Another recommendation is that the interaction of USAID and the Embassy be limited to the proposal approval stage and inaugurations at the completion of sub-projects. Under such a scenario, only USAID signatures would be required on the sub-obligating document, and USAID would be responsible for all monitoring and implementation activities as is the case in other projects.

The need for a computerized sub-project tracking system was evident during this evaluation, as the current manual system made it cumbersome to find key information. Some of the information which should be tracked under the follow-on project is listed in Section 3 e of this evaluation.

Activities carried out under the SDA do contribute to improving the effectiveness and accessibility of key democratic institutions through enhancing the participation of rural communities in the decision-making process. The local institution most frequently supported is the agrarian union which is charged with identifying and finding solutions to problems facing communities. The SDA empowers these organizations to offer solutions which would not otherwise be available.

This evaluator discovered that one design flaw in the project is that planned counterpart contribution programmed for $167,000 or 33.4% of the total grant of $500,000 is too high and probably will not be achieved. This is because approximately half the grant has been budgeted to cover USAID staff support costs. The Project Paper states that communities should contribute about 40% to the cost of sub-projects. Since only about $255,000 has been budgeted for sub-project commodities, 40% of this would only reach $102,000, less than the minimum required by USAID handbook regulations for host country contribution (in this case $125,000 or 25% of the total grant). Accordingly, it is recommended that for the follow-on project, counterpart contribution as a proportion of the total grant, should be reduced.

Lessons learned while carrying out this evaluation focus on the trade-offs which may be required when a project has several purposes. There may be a trade-off between giving communities freedom to design and implement their own projects, i.e. self-help and the achievement of USAID's concept of "immediate-impact." The concept of "time" may be impacted by culture. Although many sub-projects took six months or longer to execute, community residents never complained about excessive implementation time. In accordance with "self-help" assumptions, communities set up their own work schedules. There may also be valid trade-offs between implementing well-executed, technically sound sub-projects which do, in fact, create good will towards the U.S. in rural communities, (an unstated purpose of the SDA project), and "self-help" which may imply less than optimally constructed projects, but less USAID technical assistance. There are trade-offs in terms of USAID financial regulations and the requirements of the Controller's Office, and the administrative costs of managing small sub-projects in which the purpose is "self-help." For example, the Controller's Office endorses the current procedure under which the Project Coordinator receives advances on the part of the communities, procures commodities and cancels advances. However, this process may be inconsistent with "self-help" and one may conclude that communities should buy their own materials to construct their own projects.

Management must consider compromises and trade-offs implicit in a project with several purposes, and assign priorities. These priorities will help determine the parameters of the follow-on project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

SECTION ONE

PRINCIPAL FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report is the final evaluation of the **Special Development Activities (SDA) Project No. 511-0623** was authorized for $500,000 on June 26, 1991. The current project assistance completion date (PACD) is September 30, 1995. Nevertheless, accrued expenditures as of November 24, 1993 were $323,076 and commitments had reached $428,315. Accordingly, it is expected that all project funds will have been committed by June 1994 either on approved sub-projects or on support staff necessary for implementation. A Concept Paper for a follow-on SDA project has been sent to Washington, and it is expected that the findings, conclusions, and recommendations from this impact evaluation will contribute to the design of the new project.

This project supports the Mission's strategic objective of improving the effectiveness and accessibility of key democratic institutions through enhancing the participation of rural communities in the decision-making process. The goal of the project is to contribute to the improvement of socio-economic conditions of rural communities, preferably in remote areas of Bolivia, where there is no assistance from the Bolivian government. The project purpose is to assist small rural communities and local organizations to undertake self-help projects which have an immediate impact on the communities' social and economic welfare. The SDA provides A.I.D. funds of up to $10,000 per project.

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the impact of project activities and the effectiveness of implementation processes and strategies. Specific issues addressed in this section are whether the goal and purpose are being attained, how program objectives are being supported, how efficiently the project is being implemented, and its impact on communities.

1. ATTAINMENT OF GOAL AND PURPOSE

The goal of this project is to contribute to the improvement of socio-economic conditions of rural communities in remote areas of Bolivia. Preference is given to sub-projects in areas where assistance from the Bolivian government to carry out such projects is unavailable. The purpose of the project is to assist people in these communities to undertake self-help projects which have an immediate impact on the communities' social and economic welfare.

Sub-projects address basic needs of poor people in health, education, and production (i.e. income generation). Many consist of infrastructure projects in which the community provides local materials, transport, and unskilled labor while USAID provides building materials, and may cover the cost of skilled labor.

Some Mission staff members identified another important purpose of this project is political. Assistance to communities is identified as coming directly from the people of the United States. During inauguration ceremonies a plaque in recognition of U.S.-Bolivian collaboration is mounted. Direct assistance channeled to communities through the SDA is unique because, unlike the implementation procedures under many USAID projects, the assistance is not carried out through intermediary organizations. It is intended that beneficiaries recognize the source of this assistance, and that this, in turn, will help poor Bolivians form positive attitudes towards the U.S.

a. Are the sub-projects contributing to an improvement in the socio-economic conditions of the rural communities where they are being carried-out?

Sub-projects for the purpose of this evaluation have been grouped into five categories: a) **water projects** which include potable drinking water systems[1] or irrigation systems; b) **schools** which refer to construction or remodelling of existing schools, c) **dual projects** which provide for schools and water or latrines; d) **productive** which include vocational training centers such as metal shops and artisan centers, as well as other activities to increase income generation; e) **other** which include health posts, repair of a museum, etc.

This evaluation identified forty-four approved sub-projects[2] which have been completed, are underway, pending, or were cancelled[3] Table 1 in Annex A classifies sub-projects by type and

---

[1]These may be wells, pumps, or gravitational systems and include outlets accessible to the communities.

[2]An approved sub-project is one in which the sub-obligating document has been stamped by the USAID Controller's Office, has all required signatures, including that of the Ambassador, and has been assigned a project number by the Controller's Office. Tipas Kuchu was assigned two numbers by Controller's, but is considered as one dual project in this evaluation. The classifications and reporting numbers used in this evaluation are slightly different than those in the SARs.

[3]Four of these projects were approved and subsequently cancelled.

allows comparison between the number of proposals sent to the Project Committee and the number implemented. Tables 9 through 16 provide project descriptions and costs.

The sub-projects are improving the socio-economic conditions in the rural communities where they are being carried out. Thirty-seven percent of the proposals which were sent to the SDA Project Committee were for water projects and 37.5% of the projects which are being implemented are in this category. Twenty-seven and a half percent of the projects being carried out are classified as productive, and 20% are schools. During the course of this evaluation eleven sites were visited so that projects in all categories could be observed and their impact assessed through interviews with beneficiaries.

Community requests for water systems are the most frequent under the SDA Project. Some NGO employees have estimated that the proportion of people living in rural Bolivia without satisfactory potable water is as high as 75%. Prior to the construction of water systems under the SDA, there had been no source of clean potable water in project areas. In northern Potosí, for example, where two dual water/school projects were constructed in Jatun Khasa and Pararani, child mortality (infant to the age of five) had been identified in 1991 by CANSAVE (Save the Children Canada) as about 36% before the water systems were constructed. Diarrhea used to be the leading cause of death. Now the rate has dropped and respiratory illnesses have become the leading category of disease. Other community residents commented on the impact of clean water on their diets, that it facilitated the preparation of a larger variety of food. The school instructor in Jatun Khasa pointed out that his students have been able to improve personal hygiene and that this has reduced sickness and improved school attendance.

In the Beni three water systems were constructed for three communities, Tikala Linares, Collana, and Betanzos under sub-project No. 10159. This was the largest water system constructed under the SDA project and serves some 100 families. Community members met to discuss the impact of having over forty water outlets whereas before they had to go to the river twice a day with plastic containers to bring water to their homes. The new system means they can use water as needed and this saves time and contributes to healthier families.

Productive projects have supported a wide array of activities. These include training centers. For example, in Carmen Pampa in the Yungas Province of La Paz, a pig production center was constructed as part of a vocational training center serving both adults and younger students. In the Department of Pando SDA funds along with community counterpart funds financed a barge to transport produce to market. Other productive projects have included various training centers for artisans and metal workers.

Productive projects have helped farmers buy better agricultural tools. In Carrasco and Potosi farmers have been able to replace traditional wooden plows, with a design unchanged for centuries, with new metal models that are more efficient and time saving, and cheaper in the long run because only the metal blade need be replaced regularly. To replace a traditional model, it was necessary to cut down an entire tree, and accordingly, this was detrimental to the environment as well as to the efficiency of the farmer who had to spend several days in this endeavor.

The construction of schools was the third most frequent category of project request. Most school remodeling and construction projects also include a room for the professor who lives on-site in these isolated communities. Many of the structures being replaced had no windows or natural lighting which handicapped teaching and learning. The schools constructed under the project have windows, cement floors, blackboards, and world maps. They usually serve children from surrounding areas who had to walk as long as an hour and a half each way to attend. Having accommodations for a teacher is necessary and conducive to attracting better professors to these areas.

Once data are collected on initial applications, there is no on-going data collection process to measure continued socio-economic impact of SDA projects because the cost would be prohibitive and these are one-time small projects. In all the project-sites visited during this evaluation, the projects were functioning, and mechanisms had been set up to maintain them, i.e. monthly quotas for maintenance, or committees in charge of repairs. Community members were present at meetings with the evaluator to discuss how the sub-projects had improved their lives; they recognized that this support had come from the United States, and were grateful for it. The conclusion is that the SDA sub-projects do improve living conditions in the areas where they are carried-out.

b. Are there other sources of assistance in the beneficiary communities? What are they and do they include the Bolivian Government?

In ninety-three percent of the areas where sub-projects were implemented there were other organizations working in the zones. These organizations included NGOs, Peace Corps Volunteers, church parish workers, the Mennonite Central Committee, and the GTZ. However, there was no duplication in services or projects being provided under SDA and those being provided by the other organizations. Usually these activities complemented each other. For example, in Camarón in the Department of Tarija, the San Lorenzo parish had helped the community acquire a resident nurse for its small health post. It also provided a popular educator who traveled to the community periodically. The SDA Project provided funds for a potable water system and together these efforts have

positively impacted on health in a very isolated area[4]. Community members remarked that USAID was the first outside organization to help with an infrastructure project.

In three communities where projects have been carried out in Northern Potosí, the NGO, CANSAVE (Save the Children Canadá), operates health programs. This NGO helps the communities build health posts and provides rotating doctors to staff the posts. The SDA has helped communities construct three schools and two water systems which contribute to health. Before agreeing to school construction, the SDA Project Coordinator verifies that the GOB will provide a teacher to staff the school because infrastructure without personnel is meaningless. However, in all three Potosí communities visited, residents had made previous requests to the GOB for the construction of the school and had been turned down.

One of the important functions of other organizations working in the area according to the Project Coordinator is to facilitate communication between the community and USAID. Since the communities benefiting from SDA activities are very isolated, communities ask people associated with other organizations to carry messages to urban centers and pass them either via telephone or by bus service, etc. to the Project Coordinator at USAID.

Over the past two years there have been cases where the NGOs or other organizations have taken the lead in helping communities write letters requesting SDA assistance. For example, CIFEMA, (Centro de Investigacón y Mecanización Agricola), which manufactures and trains farmers to use more technologically advanced agricultural tools has directed communities to USAID. Nevertheless, in the communities which had purchased tools from CIFEMA using SDA funds, there was recognition in meetings during the evaluation process, that funds for the purchase had come from the U.S. Government. Nevertheless, there is a danger that when other organizations become **intermediaries**, the purpose of the SDA Project will be compromised. On the other hand, when SDA activities **complement** those being carried out by other organizations, they can have more socio-economic impact on the communities. Sometimes the communities can also take advantage of personnel resources from other organizations, such as engineers, who can provide advice during the construction of infrastructure projects. **It is recommended that there continue to be direct interaction between communities and USAID so that members are fully aware that this assistance comes from the U.S. Government. Complementary activities should also be supported.**

---

[4]Camarón is located 65 km. from Tarija, but due to almost non-existent roads, the drive takes four and a half hours, and during the rainy season from December to March, it is impassable. Parish workers walk to reach these communities.

c.   Do the SDA sub-projects have immediate impact on the welfare of the beneficiaries living in the communities?

The SDA Project Paper states that sub-projects carried out under SDA should have immediate impact on the welfare of the beneficiaries living in the communities, however, the only definition of **immediate impact** is that implementation should take about three months.   Given the nature of these sub-projects i.e. water systems, schools, training centers, health posts, etc., it can be concluded that once they are completed, they do have immediate impact on the welfare of the beneficiaries in the communities.   Nevertheless, the process from the date of the community request, either by letter or visit, until the date of completion averages 16.1 months for all projects.   Several members of the USAID/Bolivia staff, including the Director, the Chief of Development Programs, and the Project Manager defined **immediate impact** as being less than a year for the entire process, bureaucratic and implementation.

A time study was carried out on sub-projects which have been completed and the results are presented in Table 4 classified by type of project in Annex A.   Time to complete projects has been divided into two phases: 1. Bureaucratic and 2. Implementation. "Bureaucratic" refers to the period between initial request and the signing of the sub-obligating document.   This document is prepared by the USAID Office of Development Programs once a) the proposal has been approved by the Project Committee, b) the required application forms including budget have been filled out by the community, c) the sub-project folder is complete, and d) funds availability has been verified.   "Implementation" refers to the time required for actual construction.   Table 3 classifies the time to complete all projects.   Only nine out of thirty-four or 26% were completed within one year.

In all categories of projects the average **implementation time** was substantially less than the **bureaucratic time**.   Several factors explain this:

1.   **Inspection visits postponed as a result of poor weather conditions** – some of the proposed projects are sent to the Project Committee for approval before an inspection visit has been made.   Inspections are used to refine proposals, assist in the preparation of budgets, and do initial planning.   Certain communities in the San Julian area in Santa Cruz, for example, submitted letters six months before the initial inspections were carried out.   These delays were due in part to continual heavy rains.

2.   **Difficulties in securing community counterpart**

contributions - in some cases it has taken communities from one to two years to come up with counterpart funds. This is most frequently the case when farmers must come up with cash. Farming income coincides with harvests, and if the harvest is less than optimal, this impedes the ability to piovide cash counterpart. In communities of extreme poverty, it may also take time for communities to acquire their contribution. Sometimes there are natural disasters such as floods which also hinder the process.

3. **Poor communication** - some of the communities are so isolated that direct communication is very difficult, and this causes delays especially in water projects, where the quality of the water must be tested and results reported both to USAID and to the community before the project is approved.

4. **Poor transportation and access** - this is related to no. 1 and causes delays in initial inspections and subsequently, in both bureaucratic an implementation time.

5. **Internal USAID and Embassy bureaucracy** - the proposals must be approved by the Project Committee. In the last two years there have only been three Committee meetings on 1/28/91, 1/31/92 and in July 1993. In 1992 seven projects which had been approved as proposals by the Project Committee, and subsequently had met all the requirements for obligation, were sent over by USAID to the Embassy with the sub-obligating documents and were held for almost five months in the Embassy waiting for appropriate signatures.

Some of the reasons given for implementation delays include poor weather conditions, difficult communication, and poor access. Some of the project areas are so isolated, and the roads so poor, that access is virtually closed for four or five months a year. Construction work cannot be carried out during heavy rains. In addition, the agricultural cycle impacts on implementation. During the planting and harvesting seasons (which vary from zone to zone) members are not able to work on community projects. It should be noted that during this evaluation process, when beneficiaries were questioned about the time it took to carry out these projects, none complained that it was too long.

Two recommendations are offered below and others for

increasing efficiency are offered in the section on **Implementation Effectiveness.**

1. **All proposals submitted to the Project Committee should have completed files.**

2. **When cash counterpart is required, this should be verifieᵈ, as possible, before proposals are submitted to the Committee. When counterpart contribution is local materials, a verification should be made that these are available in the community[5]. When this is not the case, a plan should be developed to determine where the materials will come from, how they will be transported, and cash collected to cover these costs.**

Carrying out these recommendations will raise the probability that proposed projects sent to the Approval Committee will be implemented. Under the current SDA Project, a little less than 40% of the proposals approved by the Committee are obligated.

d.   Are these self-help projects and are counterpart contributions forthcoming in a timely manner?

The SDA Project Paper describes sub-projects as **self-help** projects which are undertaken by communities and local organizations. There is no further definition of "self-help." In the context of how the SDA has been implemented, "self-help" is defined to include the following:

1. Identification o. the project and request for USAID funding directly by the community.

2. Provision of a counterpart contribution by the community in carrying out the project. This usually includes local materials, unskilled labor, sometimes the provision of cash to transport the materials and pay skilled labor,

---

[5] In several projects, it was verified once implementation had begun that local materials, such as sand, were not of the quality needed for construction, and the sand had to be obtained from a site some 65 km. away and transported to the community. Transport costs raised the cost of counterpart contribution to a level the community could not afford, and so the SDA funds had to cover the increased cost.

or for other purchases[6].

3. Establishing a community mechanism for maintenance of the project. This includes monthly quotas to cover replacement costs, committees charged with repair services and maintenance.

4. The lack of much time line guidance to communities during the process for carrying out projects. Communities are able to plan their own implementation schedules around ag.icultural cycles, and no rigid time schedule is delineated for coming up with counterpart contributions. The result is that some communities may spend months raising their counterpart, especially when this is in cash.

The SDA Project Paper does not specify that USAID should provide technical assistance to communities carrying out sub-projects, but in fact, this is the way the Project has evolved. This evolution is primarily due to the technical nature of the sub-projects, i.e. construction of water systems and infrastructure, and the expertise of the SDA Project Coordinator who is an engineer with experience in rural health projects such as water systems. He assists the communities with the location of acceptable water sources, reviews the plans for infrastructure projects, orders the materials, and frequently assists in arranging transport for the materials. He accepts USAID advances in cash on behalf of the communities, and later, using receipts, submits vouchers to cancel the advances. Sometimes he collaborates with technical personnel such as engineers from other organizations, who provide on-site technical assistance to the communities. These tasks are specified in the contract of the Project Coordinator.

Under prior USAID administrative staff, the process described above was adopted to avoid problems with the Controller's Office which occurred when communities were unable to properly account for funds advanced to them. The Controller's Office reports that under the current system, there have been no accounting problems. However, this system places more of the responsibility for implementing sub-projects on USAID staff and less on the communities, requires more administrative time, and accordingly,

---

[6]In the Chaupisuyo Alto Project the community provided about 48% of the cash needed to purchase an electric water pump. In other communities which have purchased agricultural tools, the cash counterpart has been about 40% of the total cost. In Asanquiri the community borrowed the cash for skilled labor and transport of materials from CANSAVE.

drives up the cost of projects. It has been estimated that the real cost of an average sub-project rises almost 90% when administrative costs are considered.[7]

One problem is that there are no funds budgeted in the SDA Project for technical assistance, and communities would have to find this on their own and pay for it out of counterpart. Another issue is that if the communities found the technical assistance on their own from other NGOs, the projects might no longer be viewed as assistance from the U.S., but rather as projects of the NGOs providing technical assistance. Requiring communities to provide counterpart for TA, might well preclude working with the very poor as Project 511-0623 has done. Furthermore, USAID funds' advances are issued as checks, and many of the rural community members have never set foot in a bank, and have no proper identification to cash checks.

There may be a conflict between the concept of self-help and having projects that contribute to the welfare of beneficiaries who are very poor and live in isolated rural communities. One must ask if these beneficiaries are capable of building water systems and schools. Given that one purpose of this project is to create good will in communities towards the U.S., then well executed, functioning projects contribute to that purpose, but in very poor communities this has often required a high level of technical assistance from USAID. Self-help projects may well require a prior level of organization and development than that attained in many communities where SDA 511-0623 activities have been carried out. If the follow-on project continues to work with very poor communities, then sub-projects should be smaller and simpler so that the communities are capable of implementing them with a minimum of outside assistance.

This issue has been addressed by USAID staffs in other countries with SDA activities. In some countries SDA funds have been used primarily by Peace Corps Volunteers to implement projects in the communities where they work. In Bolivia Peace Corps Volunteers do not have a long history of working in the country as they were absent from 1971 to 1989. Currently there are ninety-nine volunteers in country, primarily in the departments of Cochabamba, Sucre, and Tarija. They have had access to a $40,000 Small Project Assistance Grant from AID funds and were able to expend $33,000 during CY 1993 on six projects carried out by six volunteers. The Deputy Peace Corps Director reported that the organization was not interested in assuming responsibility for SDA, although in at least two SDA projects, volunteers have collaborated with the SDA Project Coordinator.

---

[7]See memo from Marcos Arce to Sonia Arranibar on "Disponibilidad de Fondos para el Proyecto 511-0623," February 2, 1993.

USAID staff will have to make a decision during the design of the follow-on SDA Project as to the appropriate level of USAID technical assistance. **It is recommended that if USAID technical assistance is to continue under the new project, then the new project paper should address this activity. If technical assistance is reduced, then that will impact on the selection process, and communities should be chosen which can carry out projects with minimal assistance. In less developed, poorer communities, smaller, simpler projects should be supported so that the communities can carry out the projects with little outside assistance.**

e. What are appropriate assumptions for the logframe of the follow-on project?

The current SDA 511-0623 Project Paper does not include a logframe[8]. The follow-on project must specify what segment of the population it will support, and for what kinds of sub-projects. If it is determined that future sub-projects will be self-help with minimal technical assistance, then this may influence assumptions about beneficiaries, i.e. that they must be capable of implementing the projects they request. If the new project targets the poorest of the poor with no experience in handling funds nor sufficient expertise to build the projects they want, i.e. water systems, then collaboration with other organizations would be an assumption in the logframe. If self-help and immediate impact continue to be underlying premises, then a key assumption is that there will be sufficient requests from communities capable of implementing projects themselves or identifying and obtaining assistance from other sources to help them with the implementation.

f. What indicators and procedures are used to measure the developmental impact of the sub-projects and are they adequate?

There is no on-going data collection process to measure continued socio-economic impact of SDA Projects because the cost would be prohibitive since these are one-time small projects. Developmental impact is ascertained at the time of project identification. Guidelines for project identification specify three groups of projects:

1. water, sanitation, and health;
2. education;
3. income generating.

This evaluation found that a more appropriate classification of projects implemented would be water, school construction, and

---

[8]A logframe for the follow-on project is included in the Final Report of SDA Project 511-0412.

income generating which includes training centers[9].

During the project identification phase, which normally includes an inspection visit and filling out an application, the Project Coordinator records the number of people who are expected to benefit from the project and socio-economic characteristics of the communities. It is assumed that projects which fall within the identification guidelines will have a developmental impact and that no other indicators are necessary. The application is directed to ascertaining the need for the project and how it will be implemented. Developmental impact is assessed during evaluations. **It is recommended that the new SDA Project continue to have specific guidelines specifying acceptable kinds of sub-projects as this is the most cost-effective way to assure developmental impact.**

2. ATTAINMENT OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The program objectives supported by the SDA Project contribute to strengthening democracy. Specifically they are "improved effectiveness and accessibility of key democratic institutions." Under the SDA Project these objectives are to be accomplished through enhancing the participation of rural communities in decision-making processes.

a. Describe the decision-making process through which the community determines sub-projects. Who participates in the process and is it democratic?

Communities visited during this evaluation all had local governing structures in place. An agrarian union, *sindicato agrario*, is the basic organization which is presided over by directors, *dirigentes*, and a corrector, *corregidor*, who is charged with disciplinary matters. Union members meet regularly to discuss community problems and look for solutions. The power of the director may vary according to community, but he does have the authority to represent residents to outsiders. One director described his functions as those of a "father in a family."

Project requests are identified during union meetings. The director may then take the requests to other organizations working in the area. If they are unable to respond positively, they may refer the director to the USAID SDA office or help the director make the initial contact. Women may attend these meetings, but are usually not active participants. One director in Pararani, stated that women in meetings may identify problems facing the community, but are not supposed to present proposed solutions. Nevertheless, before reaching a solution, men usually return to their homes for

---

[9]In fact this classification is used in Semi-Annual Reviews.

discussions with their wives and return to subsequent meetings with joint ideas of the couple. This evaluator found no women in the positions of directors or correctors.

Once a project has been identified and a request made to USAID, a project committee is typically elected to carry it out. The project committee consists of anywhere from three to five members, but almost invariably includes a president to manage the process and a treasurer to collect contributions. Once the project is in place, the duties of this committee usually are directed towards maintenance.

b.   Does this project contribute to strengthening democracy at the community level, and if so, how?

The answer to this question is that the SDA Project does contribute to local empowerment, by offering democratically elected local officials solutions to community problems. It is doubtful that without SDA assistance, that community leaders would be able offer their constituents these kinds of projects. In one area of the Beni, three communities which had not had positive intra-communal relations, after having received a water system with SDA funding, have now organized an Administrative Board, *Junta Administrativa*, representing all three communities. The purpose of the board is to identify and carry out other projects beneficial to all three communities.

Elected project committees are other examples of democratic organizations in which people work together to solve their problems. The committee determines what the contributions of individual families should be and if there should be differences, (i.e. some contribute more with labor, others with cash). It is then the task of the committee to assure that all citizens make a fair contribution. The ability of local citizens to carry through a project from identification through implementation contributes to their sense of empowerment, and accordingly, strengthens democracy on the local level.

3.   IMPLEMENTATION EFFECTIVENESS

This section describes how the SDA Project 511-0623 is implemented including the identification of sub-projects, the approval process, and the monitoring and evaluation system. It also describes the roles of the Project Coordinator and Project Manager, both from job descriptions in the Scopes of Work, and jobs as they are actually carried out. The adequacy of sub-project categories is also addressed.

a.   Describe the sub-project approval process as it is currently carried out under the SDA project. Is it the same as

that identified in the Project Paper? Is it efficient and timely and what changes are recommended for improving it?

The basic approval process as it has been carried out under Project 511-0623 is that a community makes an initial request for assistance from USAID in carrying out a project[10]. The Project Coordinator reviews the request to assure that it falls within SDA guidelines, and then the request is sent to the SDA Project Committee which consists of representatives from the USAID Monitoring Committee and the Embassy Approval Committee. The Approval Committee is composed of the USAID Director and Embassy representatives. It is invited to participate in the identification, selection, approval and inauguration of sub-projects in order to give the project a Mission wide participation and to allow its members to get acquainted with local rural communities benefitting from the project. An inspection visit may have been made before the proposal is submitted to Committee[11]. Application forms are usually filled out by the community after the inspection visits and these include a budget. Once the sub-project file is complete, a formal sub-obligating document is drawn up by the USAID/DP and marked by the Controller's Office "Funds Available," signed by the USAID Director and Committee Members, and, prior to mid-1993, sent to the Embassy for appropriate signatures of the Approval Committee, including those of the DCM and Ambassador. After the community has confirmed that it has its counterpart contribution, an agreement is drafted for signature by the community, outlining their duties and responsibilities.

The Project Monitoring Committee on the USAID side consists of representatives from the offices of Development Programs and the Controller, and technical offices such as Agricultural and Rural Development, Trade and Investment, Health and Human Resources. The Approval Committee consists of the USAID Director, a representative of the Political Section, the DCM, and the Ambassador. In addition, a representative from USIS sits on the Committee. The Committee has met three times to approve SDA proposals, in January 1991, January 1992, and July 1993. In 1993 this process was slightly modified because the USAID Committee met in a separate

---

[10]This may be in a letter or by a visit. In cases where the initial request is a visit, a subsequent letter signed by community leaders is required.

[11]This evaluation confirmed that only 34.6% of projects which were subsequently obligated had received inspection visits before the Project Committee meetings for approval. One reason is that the Committee met on 1/28/91 to approve proposals which would be financed under the current SDA Project which was not obligated until 6/26/91. The funds for the inspection visits were provided by the Project, and accordingly, many inspection visits were not carried out until July 1991.

meeting seven days before Committee members in the Embassy and USIS. At these meetings, the Project Coordinator had prepared a brief description of proposals.

A total of 111 proposals was approved at these meetings, although only forty-four of these were obligated. Major reasons that only 40% were obligated include, difficulties in coming up with community counterpart contributions, inspection visits which determined that the proposed projects were infeasible or not needed, difficulties in identifying an acceptable source of water, lack of community interest, etc.. Section 1 c of this evaluation summarizes the results of extensive time studies, and reports that a number of sub-projects were held-up for over five months at the Embassy waiting for signatures after the sub-obligating document had been prepared and signed by USAID.

The process described above varies somewhat with that described in the Project Paper. According to this document, inspections should have been carried out and application forms filled out before proposals go to the Project Committee for selection. This would provide a greater probability that proposals approved by the Committee would be implemented.

It is recommended that inspection visits be carried out, documents be completed and counterpart contribution, i.e. cash and the availability of local materials be verified before proposals are submitted to the Committee. It is also recommended that interaction between USAID and the Embassy be mainly confined to the Approval Committee which should meet several times a year[12] with the USAID Monitoring Committee to identify and select proposed sub-projects. Once a proposal has been approved by the Committee, USAID/DP would prepare the approval document to be signed by the USAID/Bolivia Mission Director. Project implementation would rest with the DP Office, USAID/Bolivia. Embassy personnel would continue to be invited to inaugurations, as this contributes to recognition by communities that this assistance comes directly from the U.S.[13]

b. How are prospective sub-projects currently identified? What is the interaction between USAID/Bolivia and the Embassy in project identification?

As outlined in 3 a above, communities identify the projects

---

[12]Meeting several times a year would help make the process more efficient because a community requesting a project, for example, in March, would not have to nine months for its proposal to be approved.

[13]This procedure was suggested by the USAID Director and is consistent with the management of other USAID projects.

which they want, and then these are reviewed by the USAID Project Coordinator for their conformity to project parameters. An inspection visit verifies need and feasibility of the identified projects. Prior to 1993, the list presented to the Project Committee only included a very brief description of the proposal, its location, and any organization working in the area which was collaborating with the community project. In 1993, longer descriptions were included with the list sent to Committee.

Sometimes other members of the Committee may propose sub-projects. In one case a proposal came from the Ambassador. It is appropriate to have these proposals as long as they fall within sub-project guidelines established by the SDA.

   c. **What are the roles of the Project Coordinator and Project Manager in project implementation and how could the implementation tasks of these people be improved to increase efficiency?**

According to the contractual scope of work, the Project Coordinator has primarily a technical role in that he assists in the identification of sub-projects and subsequently submits technical reports with findings and recommendations. He interacts directly with communities to monitor the implementation of sub-projects and looks for ways to improve efficiency of the SDA. He makes inspection visits to proposed, on-going, and completed projects. He is responsible for the accounting of project funds, including the requests for and disbursement of funds, procurement and delivery of goods to beneficiary communities and account reconciliation. It seems appropriate again to point out that this last task, i.e. the procurement and delivery of goods to beneficiaries could be construed as in opposition to the concept of "self-help." There are also administrative costs associated with procurement and delivery: it is time-consuming for USAID staff; there are long-distance phone calls; additional visits to communities or urban areas near them are sometimes necessary to arrange for procurement. On the other hand, the Controller's Office stated that there have been no accounting problems under this project as there were under previous SDA projects. The Project Coordinator has received many unsolicited commendations from personnel in other organizations working in rural communities for his dedication and inter-personal relations with SDA beneficiaries. Beneficiaries appreciate the assistance he renders in helping them to complete their projects.

Under Project 511-0623 the Project Coordinator has had an important role in determining which proposals will be implemented. Only 40% of the proposals approved by the Committee were obligated. This proportion would be higher if proposals sent to approval committees had already been inspected, documentation completed, and counterpart contributions verified. If the new recommended procedures listed in 3 a are adopted for the follow-on project, then having these pre-requisites for proposals submitted to

Committee, i.e. completed inspections and documentation, and verified counterpart, would increase the probability that approved proposals would be more likely to be implemented.

The Project Manager has an oversight and planning role. He is responsible for overseeing the integral project and this includes oversight at the Project Committee. He supervises the Project Coordinator, reviews sub-project files, and is in charge of obligations and expenditures. He is informed of inaugurations and ceremonies so that he can coordinate site visits for Embassy personnel. He has written the Concept Paper for the follow-on project and will be responsible for writing the Project Paper and the Grant Agreement. Since sub-projects are carried out in very rural isolated areas, visits help project staff appreciate implementation problems. **Accordingly, it is recommended that the Project Manager attend inaugurations at least twice a year. Communication between staff of project personnel could also be improved by having clearer guidelines under the new project as to the role of different staff members, deciding in advance the appropriate amount of USAID technical assistance, and scheduling regular monthly meetings in which the Project Coordinator, Project Manager and Chief of Development Programs discuss the status of the activities and any concerns.**

d. How does the project monitoring and follow-up system function? How many site visits to sub-projects usually occur during project implementation? Estimate the cost of supervising a typical project. Describe the financial monitoring process and make recommendations for the follow-on project.

The Project Coordinator is in charge of project monitoring and follow-up. He ascertains that the documentation in the sub-project folder is complete and verifies community counterpart contribution. He also procures the non-local materials according to required technical specifications and verifies that they have been delivered. He tries to make at least one visit to the project-site during implementation and is usually present at the inauguration to do a final check.

Including initial inspections and inaugurations[14] the average number of visits per project, (including those which are pending or underway) is 2.9 and the median is 3[15]. The average number of visits per category of project is summarized on Table 6 in Annex A. Water projects frequently have more visits than other categories because the Project Coordinator requires that the quality of the water be verified and that a satisfactory source be identified before implementation begins.

---

[14]Fifteen inaugurations for completed projects are pending.

[15]Some sub-projects have received as many as seven visits.

The Project Coordinator has carried out cost analyses on SDA sub-projects and estimates that 47% of the USAID cost of an average project is allocated to SDA support personnel. This does not take into consideration the counterpart contribution. This corresponds to the budget allocations of the Controller's Office in which $239,014 (48%) has been committed to support; $254,986 (51%) has been committed to commodities; and $6,000 (1%) has been committed to other. Considering the forty approved sub-projects that have been completed, are underway, or pending (these latter with budgets), the USAID cost for commodities for these projects averages $4,656.25 while the counterpart contribution averages $2,792.10 or 37.6% of the total commodity cost. Staff support averages $4,129.13 per project, bringing the total average cost per project including counterpart contribution to $11,577.48.

Financial monitoring is carried out by both the Project Coordinator and the Controller's Office. The Project Coordinator receives advances to procure commodities and cancels these advances. He also calculates the community counterpart contributions based on a *libro de obra*, project workbook, provided by the community. This book records all project activities including days worked by local residents, local materials and their transport, payments to skilled workers, etc. A value is assigned to community labor and local materials which the community considers appropriate. The Project Coordinator meets with the financial analyst assigned to the project and supplies information on counterpart contributions. He meets with other representatives of the Controller's Office quarterly to determine accruals based on actual expenditures.

This evaluator discovered that the planned counterpart contribution of $167,000 is unlikely to be reached by the end of this project. The Project Paper states that community counterpart should contribute to about 40% of the nominal cost a sub-project[16]. To date USAID contributions to commodities for sub-projects (actual plus budgeted) total $185,250, while the community counterparts total $111,684 (37.6%). These totals include budgeted amounts for projects scheduled to be concluded in the next six months. According to AID handbook regulations local counterpart must reach a minimum of 25% of the total grant, in this case $125,000. Since almost 50% of this grant is for staff support costs, that means that the community counterpart has been under budgeted and should be a minimum of 50% of the nominal cost of a sub-project. To reach the $167,000, assuming all the earmarked totals were spent, counterpart should contribute to about 65% of the nominal cost of each sub-project. A substantial increase in the proportion of counterpart would probably exclude some of the communities living in extreme poverty from receiving SDA assistance. It is **recommended that in the follow-on project the planned counterpart**

---

[16]Nominal in this case means excluding staff support costs.

contribution be 25% of the total grant.

e. Is the project tracking system adequate and has it been incorporated into the LAN system? Are adequate monitoring indicators in use and how could they be improved?

The tracking system used during this project consists of manually recording data in each sub-project file. This system is cumbersome both for those who wish to gather data and for the administrative management. On one side of each file is the accounting information, on the other side is project implementation data. When the Project Coordinator returns from a visit, he writes in information. An automated system was designed to track the progress of each sub-project several years ago, but was never incorporated into the LAN system nor installed in the project PCs. A system for tracking financial disbursements is computerized. Until a few months ago, the Project Coordinator did not have a satisfactory computer which was why he used a manual tracking system.

It is recommended that a more efficient computerized tracking system be set up for the follow-on project. This will facilitate administrative management as well as accurate information access for evaluators, auditors, and project staff. There are certain key indicators and dates which are important and should be tracked.

1. All letters for project requests, including those which do not conform to SDA guidelines, should be listed with date and request. These are important for tracking the kinds of requests which arrive and may contribute to revision of guidelines for follow-on projects.

2. Dates of inspection visits and concise results of those visits, i.e. feasibility of proposed project should be listed

3. Date when proposal is approved by the joint USAID/Embassy Project Committee should be noted.

4. Date all documents, including application are completed and in project file should be entered.

5. Date should be noted when counterpart contribution is verified.

6. Date sub-obligating document is signed and the number assigned by the Controller's would also be input.

7. Date agreement with community is signed should be input.

8. Dates of visits during project implementation; recommendations after these visits and subsequently, whether recommendations were carried out should be entered into the system.

9. Date should be entered when project was terminated.

10. Date of inauguration should be noted.

11. Final entry should be date when accounting was closed, i.e. final entries such as counterpart contribution made, and funds de-obligated with Controller's Office.

While this information is currently available, accessing it is difficult because one must look through all the papers in each sub-project file, and manually note down the desired piece of information. A data-base system such as Fox Pro would be appropriate for this tracking system as it allows the set-up of screens for efficient data input. It also allows reports to be generated based on any one of these criterion so that information gathering would become much more efficient. The Project Coordinator supports this recommendation and has begun to implement it.

f. **Are the three categories of sub-projects (1. water, sanitation, and health; 2. education; 3. income generation;) the most adequate or should other types of projects be allowed?**

The goal of this project is developmental, that is to contribute to improvement of the socio-economic conditions of rural communities. Guidelines preclude charitable or welfare projects or those which will only benefit a few. Also excluded are the construction of parks, government buildings, books, money, contributions to religious or military institutions, construction on private lands, or the purchase of lands.

As mentioned in the previous section, one criterion to ascertain the adequacy of current project categories would be to track requests received from communities. However, this has not been done. During the twelve month period from April 1991 until March 1992 the Project Coordinator reports that 180 requests for projects were received from communities. Sixty-eight proposals[17]

---

[17]Not all 180 requests met established guidelines. Only 68 were sent to the Committee during this period, 60 proposals and 8 alternates.

were submitted to two Project Committees for approval which met in January 1992 and July 1993. That is 37.7% of the total requests received. Nevertheless, income generating, health, and education are broad categories and would include most projects with developmental orientations. Since these are "self-help" projects and USAID does not want to become more involved with technical assistance, it seems these categories are adequate.

In 1988 the Mission decided that SDA should focus more on income-generating sub-projects. An evaluation submitted in December 1988 by Checchi and Company Consulting, Inc. addressed the implications of this focus and pointed out two principal constraints:

"These are the very limited administrative, technical, and management capabilities which characterize the SDA target group organizations and, in turn, the very limited amount of staff time and technical assistance the Mission considers it can devote to the various activities of the Project, and especially those at the field level related both to routine progress monitoring and assistance in the implementation of the individual sub-projects."

This evaluation notes that while the Project Coordinator is an engineer and can lend his expertise in the construction of infrastructure, he would not necessarily be able to provide assistance to a community which wished to set up a business such as an income-generating cooperative. The Peace Corps in Bolivia has managed funds from the Small Project Assistance Grant and has completed six projects. Two of these were water projects and four were income generating. The income generating projects are incorporated into the on-going activities of current volunteers and their successors who will provide technical assistance to the communities until the projects become sustainable.

The Checchi evaluation also encourages collaboration with NGOs and other organizations working in areas where income generating sub-projects are implemented because their personnel can provide the technical assistance and monitoring support which USAID cannot. Project 511-0623 does this. For example, in four sub-projects communities used SDA funds to help finance new agricultural tools which would contribute to increased productivity. CIFEMA trained farmers in the use of these tools. Other income generating projects improve market access.

Eleven approved income generating sub-projects were carried-out. Two were approved and later cancelled due to lack of community interest. Completed, underway, or pending sub-projects include training centers, a purchase of a barge for transporting produce to market, a purchase of cereal threshers, and purchases of agricultural tools. These projects were appropriate for SDA because they did not require highly developed management, technical, or administrative capabilities of the community

residents. On the other hand, if a community does present a well-developed proposal for an income generating project, it should be given priority.

4. PROJECT IMPACT

This section assesses the project impact and how adequately it is measured. It examines the status of the current project EOPS (end-of-project-status), and the impact of the project on beneficiaries.

a. How is project impact currently measured? Are impact data collected on a regular basis and is there gender information?

Socio-economic data on the community are collected at the time the proposal application is filled out. Information is collected on the type of housing used, principal sources of income, local community organizations, educational facilities and number of students by level, sources of water, functioning water systems, electricity, available health services. Information is not collected after the sub-projects have been implemented to determine their subsequent impact on the socio-economic well-being of community members. There are no data on income levels of beneficiaries, because, according to the Project Coordinator, that is difficult to collect in rural areas and there tends to be high variation from season to season. Data collected on residents are not disaggregated by gender. **It is recommended for the follow-on project that when data are collected on community residents, i.e. number of children attending school, that such be disaggregated by gender.**

The reasons for the lack of on-going impact data are the costs of collecting it, especially since these are one-time projects and USAID staff is unlikely to return to communities where projects have been carried out except when evaluations occur. The information provided in the applications is not based on statistically determined baseline studies, and usually is compiled based on observations of the Project Coordinator or estimates of community residents. It is assumed that sub-projects which fall within SDA project identification guidelines will have positive impact. For example, one can say that whereas prior to SDA assistance, a community had no access to adequate potable water, after the installation of such a system, a given number of residents now have access to clean water. Evaluations do measure impact informally when the evaluator interviews members of the communities, but there are no statistical surveys to determine impact because of the expense incurred in a project in which nearly half of the total grant is already allocated to administrative costs.

   b. **What is the status of the current project EOPS and what is an appropriate number of sub-projects for a project with this level of funding and LOP?**

   The End of Project Status (EOPS) Indicators are to approve and complete about sixty-five sub-projects over the Life of Project (LOP). There have been to date forty-four[18] approved sub-projects of which four were cancelled after they were approved. Thirty-four have been completed, three are underway and likely to be completed, and three are pending and may or may not move forward. Completed sub-projects are somewhat understated because four of these in fact consisted of dual undertakings, that is the construction of both a water system or latrines and a school in the community. A fourth project consisted of the construction of three separate water systems to serve three neighboring communities in the Beni, but for the convenience of the Controller's Office, only one number was assigned. If these dual and triple sub-projects are counted as individual undertakings, then forty sub-projects have been completed and it is probable that the number of completions will have reached on the order of forty-three to forty-six by the time all funds are exhausted.

   The EOPS anticipated that 54% of the sub-projects would be in the water[19], sanitation, or health category, 23% would be construction or remodelling of schools; and 23% would be income generating. Using forty-three projects as the denominator[20], it is expected that 53% of the completed projects will be in the water, sanitation and health category; 26% will be construction or remodelling of schools; and about 21% will be income generating.

   As the cost of sub-projects rises with inflation and given a similar budget assigned to commodities, it seems appropriate to estimate a lower number of sub-projects for the follow-on SDA project. *Ceteris paribus*, fifty may be a more appropriate number of output indicators given the experience of Project 511-0623.

   c. **What is the estimated number of beneficiaries and what has been the impact of the sub-projects on their well-being?**

   As of September 30, 1993 the number of project beneficiaries was estimated at 8,372[21]. Approximately 40% (3,336) of these were

_____

   [18]Tipas Kuchu was assigned two numbers by Controller's, but is counted as one sub-project in this evaluation.

   [19]Water includes irrigation systems.

   [20]Forty-three includes the forty projects which have been completed and three projects which are underway.

   [21]This was the number used in the Semi-Annual Reviews.

benefitting from the new or improved water systems; 2,031 people lived in communities where schools had been constructed or remodelled; 2,282 were beneficiaries of income generating projects; and 383 were benefitting from other kinds of projects.

Interviews were conducted at project sites to determine how SDA sub-projects had impacted on the lives of people in the communities. In all, about fifty beneficiaries identified by name were interviewed, although in some communities, the evaluator was an observer at large group meetings where benefits and future needs were discussed.[22]

People who are benefitting from water systems invariably mentioned two improvements to their lives. First, was the improvement in health. Diarrheal diseases are a leading cause of sickness and death in Bolivia, and in communities with new clean potable water the incidence of this illness dropped significantly. Employees of other NGOs working in SDA areas also spoke of improved health. Better health not only focused on the drop in diarrheal diseases, but also occurred because of more opportunities to address hygienic necessities. Many of the water outlets are conveniently located near schools, and washing routines, as well as lessons on the importance of hygiene have been incorporated by teachers into the classroom. Some beneficiaries mentioned dietary benefits, because with a close, clean water supply, they were able to increase food preparation options. The second benefit which was mentioned repeatedly was the time-saving value of having more ready access to water.

Teachers in schools which had been constructed or remodelled with SDA funds reported that a big benefit in the new structures was the location of windows to provide natural light. In the prior structures windows were generally lacking and dark rooms impeded teaching. Some of the former structures were so dilapidated, the roofs were on the verge of caving in and were tied up with wire. Schools in a specific community frequently serve students from neighboring communities so having a school offers a certain prestige to the community. There is collaboration between organizations working in areas where schools have been built. For example, in Jatun Khasa Unicef donated the books and FIS (Fundación de Inversión Social) donated the desks. A new building, desks, and books have made learning much easier according to students and teachers. Teachers reported that absenteeism in the new school had fallen and that the average daily number of students attending class was twenty-five out of twenty-seven.

Another benefit which residents spoke of, was the importance of infrastructure in attracting and maintaining professors. In

---

[22]These larger meetings were in Asanquiri and the Beni where residents of Tikala Linares, Betanzos, and Collana met together.

isolated rural communities it is customary for the community to provide a room for the teacher so that he can live on site. Some teachers leave the community each week-end, but in zones with difficult access, leaves may be much less frequent. The construction of schools with SDA funds includes a room for the teacher, and better living accommodations attract better teachers.

One income-generating project visited during this evaluation was a pig-production center which was constructed in Carmen Pampa. Carmen Pampa is the only secondary school in the area and also offers vocational training in agricultural activities to adults and community residents. The pig production center is used to train people in this activity. Residents may bring female pigs to the center for mating or bring two pigs to the center for fattening. In this latter case one pig stays with the center as payment for the feed used for the other. When pigs are slaughtered, the pork is transported to La Paz where it is sold and the proceeds are used to feed and support the children of poor residents who are students in the school.

Residents of Rancho Grande reported that before the community health post was remodelled using SDA assistance, the health worker volunteer with Project Concern had operated a clinic out of his home. The conditions were less than optimal for providing health care. The remodelled center offers a well lighted facility with waiting room, treatment room, and pharmaceutical dispensary. Proceeds from the sale of pharmaceuticals will be used in part to establish a maintenance fund for small repairs of the center. In this isolated community, day-to-day care depends on the volunteer health worker and the resources at his disposal which is why the health post improves the well-being of the community. Residents of Rancho Grande have a relatively developed organizational structure and had, in the past, worked on self-help projects with other organizations such as Food for the Hungry (FH) on projects where local counterpart was required.

SECTION TWO

LESSONS LEARNED

Trade-offs may be implicit as project implementors try to achieve different project purposes. Such is the case with the

Special Development Activities Project No. 511-0623 which provides assistance to rural communities to carry out "immediate impact/ self-help" projects. In addition to supporting "self-help" and "immediate impact" sub-projects, the SDA project has the unstated purpose to create good will on the part of the people of Bolivia towards those in the U.S. The following are lessons learned from this project.

1.   **There may be a trade-off between giving communities freedom to design and implement their own projects, i.e. self-help and the achievement of USAID's concept of "immediate impact".** "Self-help" implies that projects are implemented by communities with a minimum of outside assistance. "Immediate impact" implies a short implementation time. Yet "time" is impacted by culture. Although many sub-projects carried out under 511-0623 took six months or longer to execute, community residents never complained about excessive implementation time. In accordance with "self-help" assumptions, communities set up their own work schedules, convenient to them given agricultural cycles and weather conditions. Nor was a rigid time line imposed on collecting counterpart contributions. Accordingly, the implementation was sometimes lengthy and may have been longer than the USAID concept of "immediate impact," but still consistent with beneficiary concepts of "immediate impact".

2.   **There may be valid trade-offs between implementing well-executed, technically sound sub-projects which do, in fact, create good will in rural residents towards the U.S. and "self-help" which may imply less well-constructed projects, but less USAID technical assistance.** A small USAID project may well be as expensive to manage as a larger project. This means that a larger proportion of project funding in the smaller activity is allocated to administration. USAID management, after considering the trade-offs, must determine how much technical assistance and management is appropriate for a project of the magnitude of the SDA and the small sub-projects it supports.

3.   **There are trade-offs in terms of USAID financial regulations and the requirements of the Controller's Office, and the administrative costs of managing a small project in which the purpose is "self-help."** The Controller's Office endorses the current procedure under which the Project Coordinator receives advances on the part of the communities, procures commodities and cancels the advances with vouchers. However, this process has an implied inconsistency with "self-help" and one may ask, shouldn't communities buy their own materials to construct their own projects?

Management must consider compromises and trade-offs implicit in a project with several purposes, and assign priorities. These priorities will help determine the parameters of the follow-on project.

4.   In small SDA projects where approximately half of the
direct assistance funding is for USAID administrative costs and all
of the counterpart funding is raised by poor communities (rather
than ESF or PL480), project designers should budget the minimum
host country contribution permitted by handbook regulations.   In
Project 511-0623, requiring community counterpart of approximately
40% per sub-project was not unreasonable.   However, only $254,986
of the $500,000 grant was obligated for sub-project commodities,
and 40% of this amount is $101,944 which is less than the $125,000
minimum host country contribution required for a project in which
USAID puts up $500,000.   The $167,000 of programmed host country
counterpart contribution represents almost 66% of the amount
obligated for sub-projects, and it is doubtful that it will be
achieved.

SECTION THREE

ISSUES FOR FOLLOW-ON PROJECT

1.   What is the role of the Project Coordinator?   According
       to the contractual scope of work, the coordinator "is
       responsible   for   the   accounting   of   project   funds,
       including submission of requests for and disbursement of
       funds, procurement and delivery of goods to beneficiary
       communities and account reconciliation."   Should the
       Project Coordinator procure commodities for communities
       to carry out sub-projects?   This procedure has been
       developed over time and has proven to be convenient for
       the Controller's Office.   Is it appropriate for the
       Project Coordinator to have this function? How much on-
       site technical assistance should the Project Coordinator
       provide to a community?   Could the community access
       technical assistance from other sources such as NGOs
       working in the area?   Although this might lower the
       burden on the Project Coordinator and result in reduced
       costs, it could also reduce the quality of the sub-
       projects.

2.   Some USAID staff members have said that the SDA project
       has   a   political   purpose.   It   is   intended   that
       beneficiaries recognize the source of assistance to their
       communities as coming directly from the United States,
       and this, in turn, will help poor Bolivians form positive
       attitudes towards the U.S.   The SDA is unique because,
       unlike the implementation procedures under many USAID
       projects, communities directly request and   receive
       assistance.   Is this political objective an important
       purpose of the project and would it be compromised if

USAID collaborated with NGOs, Peace Corps Volunteers, or local officials to implement sub-projects? If it is determined that collaboration is appropriate, could the implementation process be developed so that technical assistance and costs would be reduced?

3. How should counterpart contributions be calculated? Under the current project approximately 50% of the budget is allocated to administrative costs. The Project Paper states that counterpart contribution should be equal to about 40% of the total cost of the sub-projects (this does not include USAID administrative costs). Handbook 3 states that it should be a minimum of 25% of the total project funding including administrative costs. Is this fair, given the proportion of USAID administrative costs under a project this small and directed towards helping very poor people? Would 25% of the total cost of sub-projects be more appropriate?

4. Define **self-help** and **immediate impact**. What are the implications of these new definitions to the role of the Project Coordinator and collaboration with other organizations? When should USAID/Bolivia begin tracking time on sub-projects, from the date of the request, the date the Committee approves the proposal, or the date the sub-obligating document is signed? What is an appropriate time for sub-project implementation?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arce, Marcos. "Actividades Especiales para el Desarrollo: Informe Trimestral: Julio a Septiembre de 1991." October 16, 1991.

_____. "Actividades Especiales para el Desarrollo: Informe Triemestral: Octubre a Diciembre de 1991." January 3, 1992.

_____. "Actividades Especiales para el Desarrollo: Informe Trimestral: Enero a Marzo 1992." April 1, 1992.

_____. "Formulario de Solicitud de Fondos del Proyecto de Actividades Especiales de Desarrollo." July 22, 1992.

_____. Memorandum of January 23, 1991 to McAffee et al. on "SDA Project Implementation and Monitoring Meetings."

_____. Memorandum of February 2, 1993 to Sonia Arranibar on "Disponibilidad de Fondos para el Proyecto 511-0623."

Checchi and Company Consulting, Inc., "Final Report. Special Development Activities (SDA) Project Evaluation; Project # 511-0000.04." December 1988.

Davidson, Garber A. Memorandum of July 15, 1993 to Mr. David B. Dlouhy, DCM, on "Special Development Activities Project No. 511-0623."

SDA Project Files on forty-five SDA sub-project activities.

Smith, Steve. Memorandum of July 13, 1992 to Mr. David B. Dlouhy, Deputy Chief of Mission, on "Approval of Special Development Activities Project."

Tate, Wayne. Memorandum of January 2, 1992 to McAfee et al. on "SDA Project Implementation and Monitoring Committee Meeting."

USAID/Bolivia. Contract No. 511-0623-S-00-1408. Article I. Statement of Duties for Project Coordinator.

_____. Project Paper. Special Development Activities. June 1991.

_____. Proyecto de Actividades Especiales para el Desarrollo (USAID 511-0412); Informe Final. August 1991.

_____. Semi-Annual Report. Period April 1, 1993 to September 30, 1993. Project Status Report on Special Development Activities Project.

ANNEX A

TABLES

1. CLASSIFICATION OF PROJECT PROPOSALS

CLASSIFICATION	CARRIED-OUT[1]		NOT CARRIED-OUT[2]		TOTAL PROPOSALS[3]	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
WATER[4]	15	37.5%	24	34%	41	37%
SCHOOLS	8	20%	18	25%	26	23%
DUAL[5]	4	10 %	2	3%	5	5%
PRODUCTIVE[6]	11	27.5%	22	31%	32	29%
OTHERS[7]	2	5%	5	7%	7	6%
TOTAL	40	100%	71	100%	111	100%

---

[1]Projects completed, pending, and underway. Forty-four approved sub-projects were assigned numbers by the Controller's. Tipas Kuchu was assigned two numbers, bringing the total to 45. 4 projects were cancelled and are not included in this column as "carried-out."

[2]Includes projects which were assigned numbers and subsequently cancelled or in which formal approval is doubtful

[3]Refers to proposals which were sent to the SDA Committee. Includes those selected as alternates.

[4]One project is three systems of water for three communities, but with one number assigned by Controller's. It is counted here as one project.

[5]Refers to two-part projects which consist of water systems and schools, or latrines. One of these, Tipas Kuchu was assigned two numbers, although it is counted as one project in this evaluation.

[6]Refers to income-generating and includes training centers.

[7]Includes one request submitted directly by the Ambassador which did not pass through the Committee.

2. AVERAGE TIME TO COMPLETE ALL PROJECTS[1]

	BUREAUCRATIC TIME	IMPLEMENTATION TIME	TOTAL
AVERAGE	12.1	4.0	16.1
STANDARD DEVIATION	6.6	3.0	6.8
MEDIAN	10	4	17

3. TIME TO COMPLETE PROJECTS[2]

TIME	1 Yr. or Less	> 1 yr. to < 1.5 yrs.	1.5 yrs to < 2 yrs.	2 yrs. +
No. PROJECTS	9	14	5	6

---

[1]In months

[2]Includes both bureaucratic and implementation phase.

4. AVERAGE LENGTH OF TIME TO COMPLETE PROJECTS ACCORDING TO TYPE OF PROJECT[1]

	BUREAUCRATIC[2]	IMPLEMENTATION[3]	TOTAL[4]
WATER	15.8	3.4	19.2
SCHOOL	10.5	5.3	15.8
DUAL	8.9	6.8	15.7
PRODUCTIVE	8.1	2.5	10.6
OTHER	13.0	6.0	19.0

---

[1] Only includes completed projects: 14 - water, 6 - schools, 4 - dual, 8 - productive, 1 - other.

[2] Bureaucratic time includes months from receipt of request to signing the Agreement. The Agreement is not signed until counterpart contribution is verified.

[3] Implementation time refers to months lapsed between signing of agreement and project completion.

[4] Includes number of months from initial request to project completion. Only includes completed projects.

5. AVERAGE NUMBER OF VISITS TO ALL PROJECTS

NUMBER OF PROJECTS	NUMBER OF VISITS	AVERAGE NO. VISITS	MEDIAN NO. VISITS
40	117	2.9	3

6. AVERAGE NO. VISITS[1] BY TYPE OF PROJECT[2]

	No. PROJECTS	No. VISITS	AVERAGE No. VISITS
WATER	15	55	3.7
SCHOOL	8	22	2.8
DUAL	4	11	3.0
PRODUCTIVE	11	22	2.0
OTHER	2	7	3.5
TOTAL	40	117	3.1

---

[1]Includes initial inspections and inaugurations.

[2]Includes projects which have been completed, are underway, or pending.

7. SOURCE OF FUNDS BY LOCATION OF PROJECT[1]
US$

	COMMUNITY COUNTERPART CONTRIBUTION		USAID CONTRIBUTION		TOTAL
LA PAZ	10,416	50%	10,395	50%	20,811
COCHABAMBA	22,310	41%	32,585	59%	54,895
POTOSI	24,355	35%	45,619	65%	69,974
ORURO	7,180	29%	17,416	71%	24,596
TARIJA	9,544	29%	23,181	71%	32,725
SANTA CRUZ	21,695	41%	30,646	59%	52,341
BENI	15,000	43%	20,135	57%	35,135
PANDO	1,184	18%	5,273	82%	6,457
TOTAL	111,684	37.6%	185,250	62.4%	296,934

[1]Includes budgeted funds for projects which are scheduled to be completed during the next six months.

8. SOURCES OF FUNDS BY TYPE OF PROJECT[1]
US$

	COMMUNITY COUNTERPART		USAID CONTRIBUTION		TOTAL
WATER	38,991	38%	64,212	62%	103,203
SCHOOL	13,164	39%	20,479	61%	33,643
DUAL	7,960	29%	19,261	71%	27,221
PRODUCTIVE	46,746	39%	72,771	61%	119,517
OTHER	4,823	36%	8,527	36%	13,350
TOTAL	111,684	38%	185,250	62%	296,934

[1]All figures include budgeted amounts for projects not yet completed.

9. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND COST BY LOCATION
DEPARTMENT: LA PAZ

PROJECTS BY NAME AND NUMBER	DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT	COMMUNITY COUNTERPART CONTRIBUTION US $	USAID CONTRIBUTION US $	TOTAL COST US $
Carmen Pampa 10093	Training center for pig production.	$6,616	$4,895	$11,511
Chipamaya 10095	Greenhouses	cancelled		
Aukapata 10251	Roof for museum	$3,800 (budgeted)	$5,500 (budgeted)	$9,300 (budgeted)
Quenallata	School	Not officially approved; no communication from community for months.		

10. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND COST BY LOCATION
DEPARTMENT: COCHABAMBA

PROJECTS BY NAME AND NUMBER	DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT	COMMUNITY COUNTERPART CONTRIBUTION US $	USAID CONTRIBUTION US $	TOTAL COST US $
Tipas Kuchu 10166/ 10140	Potable water and latrines.	$ 2,500	$ 5,458	$ 7,958
Chijmuri 10155	Threshing mill	Cancelled due to lack of interest of community.		
Vinto Chico 10157	Irrigation system	$ 3,500	$ 4,613	$ 8,113
Amanecer 10158	Metal shop training center	$ 5,000	$ 7,083	$12,083
Cochabamba 9 Communities 10202	Agricultural tools (plows)	$ 7,396	$11,064	$18,460
Paracti 10243	School	$ 314	$ 556	$ 870
Chaupisuyo Alto 10271	Electric water pump	$ 2,500	$ 2,711	$ 5,211
Cebada Jichana 10276	Two cereal threshers	$ 1,100	$1,100	$ 2,200

11. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND COST BY LOCATION
DEPARTMENT: POTOSI

PROJECTS BY NAME AND NUMBER	DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT	COMMUNITY COUNTERPART CONTRIBUTION US $	USAID CONTRIBUTION US $	TOTAL COST US $
Pararani 10096	Potable water/school	$ 2,373	$ 6,959	$ 9,332
Jatun Khasa 10139	Potable water/school	$ 2,332	$ 8,304	$ 10,636
Potosi 11 Communities 10196	Agricultural tools	$ 5,568	$ 8,339	$13,907
Charcas 9 Communities 10274	Agricultural tools	$ 6,969 (budgeted)	$10,149 (budgeted)	$17,118 (budgeted)
Chayanta, A. Ibañez 10275	Agricultural tools	$5,913 (budgeted)	$ 8,868 (budgeted)	$14,781 (budgeted)
Asanquiri 10278	School	$ 1,200 (budgeted)	$ 3,000 (budgeted)	$ 4,200 (budgeted)

12. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND COST BY LOCATION
DEPARTMENT: ORURO

PROJECTS BY NAME AND NUMBER	DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT	COMMUNITY COUNTERPART CONTRIBUTION US $	USAID CONTRIBUTION US $	TOTAL COST US $
Sora Sora 10247	Artisan Center	$3,000 (budgeted)	$6,000 (budgeted)	$ 9,000 (budgeted)
Rancho Grande 10248	Health Post	$1,023	$3,027	$ 4,050
Rosasani 10261	Potable water (two wells and hand pumps)	$ 157	$ 389	$ 546
Lacalacani 10262	Potable water	$3,000 (budgeted)	$8,000 (budgeted)	$11,000 (budgeted)

13. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND COST BY LOCATION
DEPARTMENT: TARIJA

PROJECTS BY NAME AND NUMBER	DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT	COMMUNITY COUNTERPART CONTRIBUTION US $	USAID CONTRIBUTION US $	TOTAL COST US $
Churquis Centro 10197	Potable water for school	$ 600	$3,893	$4,493
Churquis Sud 10198	Potable water	cancelled	cancelled	cancelled
Orozas Arriba 10199	School	$2,150	$3,403	$5,553
Camaron 10200	Potable water	$ 450	$3,147	$3,597
Alto España 10201	Potable water	$1,089	$4,220	$5,309
Volcan Blanco 20097	School	$ 500	$1,214	$1,714
San Pedro 20098	School	$ 500	$1,178	$1,678
Garrapatas 20099	School	$ 500	$1,058	$1,558
Acherales 20100	School	$ 500	$1,070	$1,570
Pampa Grande 20101	School, hand pump, latrines	$3,255	$3,998	$7,253

14. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND COST BY LOCATION
DEPARTMENT: SANTA CRUZ

PROJECTS BY NAME AND NUMBER	DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT	COMMUNITY COUNTERPART CONTRIBUTION US $	USAID CONTRIBUTION US $	TOTAL COST US $
Los Cafeses 10091	well/pump	$3,314	$3,995	$ 7,309
Nucleo 7 Belen 10092	Well/pump	$1,801	$1,700	$ 3,501
Villa Camargo 10094	Well/pump	$1,620	$1,598	$ 3,218
La Niña 10097	Potable water (two wells/pumps)	$ 850	$ 646	$ 1,496
Los Tigres 10098	Potable water (well/pump)	$ 340	$ 300	$ 640
Barrio Lindo 10180	School	$7,500 (budgeted)	$9,000 (budgeted)	$16,500 (budgeted)
Bolivar 10244	Potable water	cancelled	cancelled	cancelled
15 and 2 de Agosto 10245	Potable water (two wells/pumps)	$ 770	$1,366	$ 2,136
Porvenir 10246	Well/pump	$ 500	$ 680	$ 1,180
Illimani 10249	Two wells/pumps	$1,000	$1,361	$ 2,361
Izozog 10263	Artesan shop	0 (pending) $4,000 budgeted	0 (pending) $10,000 budgeted	$14,000 (budgeted)

15. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND COST BY LOCATION
DEPARTMENT: BENI

PROJECTS BY NAME AND NUMBER	DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT	COMMUNITY COUNTERPART CONTRIBUTION US $	USAID CONTRIBUTION US $	TOTAL COST US $
Tikala Linares, Collana, Betanzos 10159	3 systems of potable water for 3 communities	$15,000 (budgeted)	$20,135	$35,135[1]

---

[1]Although these three projects were only assigned one number by the USAID Controller's Office, they consist of three water systems for three communities.

16. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND COST BY LOCATION
DEPARTMENT: PANDO

PROJECTS BY NAME AND NUMBER	DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT	COMMUNITY COUNTERPART CONTRIBUTION US $	USAID CONTRIBUTION US $	TOTAL COST US $
Yaminahua 10156	Commercialization of rubber, wheat, Brazil nuts[1]	$1,184	$5,273	$6,457

---

[1] Project consists of financing a boat/barge to carry products to market.

17. TIME REQUIRED TO COMPLETE PROJECTS I

APPROVED PROJECTS BY NAME AND NUMBER	DATE OF LETTER OR INFORMAL REQUEST FROM COMMUNITY	DATE PROJECT PROPOSAL APPROVED BY USAID COMMITTEE MEMBERS	DATE PROJECT PROPOSAL APPROVED BY EMBASSY COMMITTEE MEMBERS	DATE SUB-OBLIGATING DOCUMENT SIGNED	DATE AGREEMENT SIGNED	DATE OF PROJECT COMPLETION
Los Cafeses 10091	12/10/90	1/28/91	1/28/91	7/17/91	8/20/91	9/18/91
Nucleo 7 Belen 10092	12/10/90	1/28/91	1/28/91	7/17/91	8/20/91	9/7/91
Carmen Pampa 10093	1/9/91	1/28/91	1/28/91	8/17/91	8/25/91	3/15/92
Villa Camargo 10094	12/10/90	1/28/91	1/28/91	7/17/91	8/20/91	9/12/91
Chipamaya 10095	8/2/90	1/28/91	1/28/91	7/17/91	cancelled	cancelled
Pararani 10096	11/12/90	1/28/91	1/28/91	7/17/91	9/16/91	12/24/91 (school) 7/6/92 (water)
La Niña 10097	12/10/90	1/28/91	1/28/91	7/17/91	6/13/92	8/24/92
Los Tigres 10098	11/27/90	1/28/91	1/28/91	7/17/91	10/5/91	10/29/91
Jatun Khasa 10139	11/11/90	1/28/91	1/28/91	9/1/91	9/91	8/92
Tipas Kuchu 10166	7/24/91[1]	1/28/91	1/28/91	9/9/91	11/10/91	1/23/92
Chijmuri 10155	1/24/91	1/28/91	1/28/91	10/15/91	cancelled	cancelled

---

[1]No letter from community found in project file. Letter was written by Programa de Asistencia Agrobioenergetica (PAAC) on behalf of community.

18. TIME REQUIRED TO COMPLETE PROJECTS II

APPROVEDED PROJECTS BY NAME AND NUMBER	DATE OF LETTER OR INFORMAL REQUEST FROM COMMUNITY	DATE PROJECT PROPOSAL APPROVED BY USAID COMMITTEE MEMBERS	DATE PROJECT PROPOSAL APPROVED BY EMBASSY COMMITTEE MEMBERS	DATE SUB-OBLIGATING DOCUMENT SIGNED	DATE AGREEMENT SIGNED	DATE OF PROJECT COMPLETION
Yaminahua 10156	12/3/90	1/28/91	1/28/91	10/15/91	11/10/91	3/6/92
Vinto Chico 10157	12/18/90	1/28/91	1/28/91	10/15/91	10/30/91	5/3/92
Amanecer 10158	1/25/91	1/28/91	1/28/91	10/15/91	11/91	3/17/92
Tikala Linares, Collana, Betanzas 10159	12/90	1/28/91	1/28/91	10/15/91	10/28/91	8/25/92
Barrio Lindo 10180	1/14/91	1/28/91	1/28/91	12/9/91	10/27/93[1]	underway
Potosi 11 Communities 10196	11/29/91	1/31/92	1/31/92	4/8/92	11/26/92	12/16/92
Churquis Centro 10197	9/27/91	1/31/92	1/31/92	4/8/92	6/15/92	2/28/93
Churquis Sud 10198	9/27/91	1/31/92	1/31/92	4/8/92	not in file project cancelled	cancelled

---

[1]Work on school project was suspended indefinitely after Rio Grande flooded. Work was reinitiated 8/16/93 and agreement was signed 10/27/93.

19. TIME REQUIRED TO COMPLETE PROJECTS III

APPROVED PROJECTS BY NAME AND NUMBER	DATE OF LETTER OR INFORMAL REQUEST FROM COMMUNITY	DATE PROJECT PROPOSAL APPROVED BY USAID COMMITTEE MEMBERS	DATE PROJECT PROPOSAL APPROVED BY EMBASSY COMMITTEE MEMBERS	DATE SUB-OBLIGATING DOCUMENT SIGNED	DATE AGREEMENT SIGNED	DATE OF PROJECT COMPLETION
Orozas Arriba 10199	10/17/91	1/31/92	1/31/92	4/8/92	6/29/92	3/26/93
Camaron 10200	10/2/91	1/31/92	1/31/92	4/8/92	5/20/92	1/8/93
Alto España 10201	4/91	1/31/92	1/31/92	4/8/92	3/12/93	9/30/93[1]
Cochabamba 9 Communities 10202	7/9/91	1/31/92	1/31/92	4/8/92	6/19/92	8/13/92
Paracti 10243	8/29/91	1/31/92	1/31/92	11/24/92[2]	3/29/93	6/93
Bolívar 10244	11/13/90	1/28/91	1/28/91	11/24/92 see note #2	[3]	cancelled

---

[1]Initially community was receiving T.A. from the Pastoral Social of Tarija. USAID project coordinator found that water was badly sourced. The Pastoral did not participate in work to take water from new source and project was delayed because community did not have technical assistance to put in system.

[2]Sub-obligating document sent to Embassy 7/92 and not signed until 11/92.

[3]Community received assistance from another organization while waiting for an inspection from SDA coordinator and for Embassy to sign sub-obligating document, community received assistance from another organization.

20. TIME REQUIRED TO COMPLETE PROJECTS IV

APPROVED PROJECTS BY NAME AND NUMBER	DATE OF LETTER OR INFORMAL REQUEST FROM COMMUNITY	DATE PROJECT PROPOSAL APPROVED BY USAID COMMITTEE MEMBERS	DATE PROJECT PROPOSAL APPROVED BY EMBASSY COMMITTEE MEMBERS	DATE SUB-OBLIGATING DOCUMENT SIGNED	DATE AGREEMENT SIGNED	DATE OF PROJECT COMPLETION
15 & 2 de Agosto 10245	11/13/90	1/28/91	1/28/91	12/4/92 [1]	12/16/92	2/2/93
Porvenir 10246	11/13/90	1/28/91	1/28/91	12/4/92 see note # 1	12/16/92	1/27/93
Sora Sora 10247	3/1/92[2]	1/28/91	1/28/91	12/4/92 see note # 1	9/1/93	underway
Rancho Grande 10248	3/10/92	1/31/92	1/31/92	12/4/92 see note # 1	4/10/93	10/93
Illimani 10249	1/18/92	1/28/91	1/28/91	12/4/92 see note # 1	12/16/92	1/27/93
Aukapata 10251	9/6/92	[3]		1/28/93	see note # 3	pending

[1]Sub-obligating document sent to Embassy 7/92 and not signed until 11/92.

[2]Peace Corps volunteers working in the area had made previous contact with USAID on behalf of the community. However, the earliest letter in the file signed by community members was dated 3/1/92.

[3]This project was not sent to the committee. The letter of request from the National Institute of Archaeology for a new roof on a museum was sent directly to the Ambassador who requested that USAID proceed. Subsequently the staff never sent plans and seems to have arranged for the work with another organization. A USAID decision is pending.

21. TIME REQUIRED TO COMPLETE PROJECTS V

APPROVED PROJECTS BY NAME AND NUMBER	DATE OF LETTER OR INFORMAL REQUEST FROM COMMUNITY	DATE PROJECT PROPOSAL APPROVED BY USAID COMMITTEE MEMBERS	DATE PROJECT PROPOSAL APPROVED BY EMBASSY COMMITTEE MEMBERS	DATE SUB-OBLIGATING DOCUMENT SIGNED	DATE AGREEMENT SIGNED	DATE OF PROJECT COMPLETION
Rosasani 10261	8/22/91	1/31/92	1/31/92	3/27/93	6/24/93	9/23/93
Lacalacani 10262	12/27/91	1/31/92	1/31/92	3/31/93	not signed	pending[1]
Izozog 10263	10/28/91	1/31/92	1/31/92	3/31/93	not signed	pending[2]
Chaupisuyo Alto 10271	12/5/90	1/28/91	1/28/91	7/13/93[3]	7/20/93	8/23/93
Charcas #9 10274	3/7/93	7/13/93	7/20/93	9/16/93	10/10/93	11/25/93
Chayanta, A. Ibañez 10275	5/10/93	7/13/93	7/20/93	9/16/93	10/10/93	11/26/93

---

[1]Community needs technical assistance to carry out water project. Community proposed hand pumps which are not a feasible solution due to lack of underground water. Water source proposed by community is contaminated. Will need more assistance to identify satisfactory source and to implement project. USAID collaborating with Peace Corps.

[2]Community located on border of Paraguay and communication is difficult. Community agreed to send official request form, with budget and confirmation of counterpart. No communication received since 3/93.

[3]Community needed counterpart of about US$2,700. By January 1993 they had US$2,500. On 7/8/93 they wrote USAID stating that they couldn't come up with the required $2,700, but USAID decided to move forward with project.

22. TIME REQUIRED TO COMPLETE PROJECTS

APPROVED PROJECTS BY NAME AND NUMBER	DATE OF LETTER OR INFORMAL REQUEST FROM COMMUNITY	DATE PROJECT PROPOSAL APPROVED BY USAID COMMITTEE MEMBERS	DATE PROJECT PROPOSAL APPROVED BY EMBASSY COMMITTEE MEMBERS	DATE SUB-OBLIGATING DOCUMENT SIGNED	DATE AGREEMENT SIGNED	DATE OF PROJECT COMPLETION
Cebada Jichana 10276	7/11/93	7/13/93	7/20/93	9/16/93	9/27/93	9/30/93
Asanquiri 10278	3/30/93	7/13/93	7/20/93	9/22/93	10/18/93	underway scheduled 1/94[1]
Volcan Blanco 20097	6/1/91	1/31/92	1/31/92	6/5/92	5/31/92	11/15/92[2]
San Pedro 20098	5/30/91	1/31/92	1/31/92	6/5/92	5/30/92	11/15/92 See note #2.
Garrapatas 20099	6/1/91	1/31/92	1/31/92	6/5/92	5/31/92	11/15/92 See note #2.
Acherales 20100	6/1/91	1/31/92	1/31/92	6/5/92	6/1/92	11/15/92 See note #2.
Pampa Grande 20101	6/1/91	1/31/92	1/31/92	6/5/92	6/1/92	11/15/92 See note #2.
Quenallata	10/9/92	7/13/93	7/20/93	not signed	not signed	pending

[1]No sand or gravel in area for local counterpart contribution. These materials must be transported. Road frequently closed during rainy season, making transport of USAID-provided commodities difficult.

[2]No access road to community. Materials transported by animals of burden. Rainy season delays progress.

23. IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS: NO. OF INSPECTION VISITS I

APPROVED/OBLIGATED PROJECTS BY NAME AND NUMBER	DATE OF INITIAL OR IDENTIFICATION INSPECTIONS	DATES OF VISITS DURING PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION	DATES OF PROJECT INAUGURATION VISITS
Los Cafeses 10091	7/17/91	7/29/92	pending
Nucleo 7 Belen 10092	7/17/91	7/29/92	pending
Carmen Pampa 10093	7/23/91	10/30/91, 1/27/92	3/27/92
Villa Camargo 10094	7/19/91	8/12/91	pending
Chipamaya 10095	7/15/91		cancelled
Pararani 10096	11/17/90	10/23/91, 6/25/92	8/13/92
La Niña 10097	7/19/91	7/27/92	12/6/92
Los Tigres 10098	7/19/91	7/26/92	12/6/92
Jatun Khasa 10139	11/7/90	10/23/91, 6/25/92	8/13/92
Tipas Kuchu 10140	8/7/91	10/24/91	pending
Chijmuri 10155	8/17/91		cancelled 9/28/92

24. IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS: NO. OF INSPECTION VISITS II

APPROVED/OBLIGATED PROJECTS BY NAME AND NUMBER	DATE OF INITIAL OR IDENTIFICATION INSPECTIONS	DATES OF VISITS DURING PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION	DATES OF PROJECT INAUGURATION VISITS
Yaminahua 10156	12/91	1/24/92, 2/10/92,	3/9/92
Vinto Chico 10157	6/28/91	10/24/91, 7/1/92, 2/22/92, 9/23/92	11/4/92
Amanecer 10158	6/26/91	2/19/92	4/92
Tikala Linares, Collana, Betanzos 10159	9/12/90	11/13/91,	5/7/93
Barrio Lindo 10180	7/29/91	8/18/93, 12/16/93	underway
Potosi 11 Communities 10196	11/21/91	6/16/92	12/16/92
Churquis Centro 10197	9/19/91	4/27/92, 6/8/92, 9/11/92, 10/26/92, 2/9/93	5/27/93
Churquis Sud 10198	9/19/91	10/26/92, 2/9/93	project cancelled
Orozas Arriba 10199	9/18/91	4/29/92, 6/10/92, 9/9/92, 10/27/92, 12/1/92	5/27/93
Camaron 10200	4/28/92	6/9/92, 10/28/92	pending
Alto España 10201	9/17/91, 2/11/93 (for rewritten proposal)	2/11/93, 3/10/93, 3/12/93, 5/3/93, 5/26/93	pending

25. IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS: NO. OF INSPECTION VISITS III

APPROVED/OBLIGATED PROJECTS BY NAME AND NUMBER	DATE OF INITIAL OR IDENTIFICATION INSPECTIONS	DATES OF VISITS DURING PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION	DATES OF PROJECT INAUGURATION VISITS
Cochabamba 9 Communities 10202	5/13/92	7/2/92	8/13/92
Paracti 10243	8/29/91	3/24/93, 4/22/93, 5/13/93, 6/28/93	pending
Bolivar 10244	7/19/91	cancelled	cancelled
15 & 2 de Agosto 10245	7/19/91	12/16/92	8/20/93
Porvenir 10246	7/19/91	12/16/92	8/20/93
Sora Sora 10247	19/90	2/18/93	underway
Rancho Grande 10248	2/6/92	4/8/93, 7/29/93, 9/1/93, 9/10/93,	11/16/93
Illimani 10249	7/19/91	12/16/92	8/20/93
Aukapata 10251	10/21/92		pending (may be cancelled)
Rosasani 10261	6/21/91	6/24/93,	pending
Lacalacani 10262	2/6/92	2/19/93, 4/6/93	pending

26. IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS: NO. OF INSPECTION VISITS IV

APPROVED/OBLIGATED PROJECTS BY NAME AND NUMBER	DATE OF INITIAL OR IDENTIFICATION INSPECTIONS	DATES OF VISITS DURING PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION	DATES OF PROJECT INAUGURATION VISITS
Izozog 10263	12/91	10/14/92	
Chaupisuyo Alto 10271	8/9/91	9/11/92, 6/29/93	9/17/93
Charcas #9 10274	6/15/93	none in file	pending
Chayanta, A. Ibañez 10275	6/15/93	none in file	pending
Cebada Jichana 10276	8/4/93	none in file	pending
Asanquiri 10278	3/25/93	11/8/93	
Volcan Blanco 20097	5/27/92	none	pending
San Pedro 20098	5/27/92	none	pending
Garrapatas 20099	5/28/92	none	pending
Acherales 20100	5/28/92	none	pending
Pampa Grande 20101	5/26/92	none	pending
Quenallata	7/26/93		

ANNEX B

METHODOLOGY

METHODOLOGY

The methodology for this evaluation included interviews with beneficiaries, USAID personnel, and personnel of NGOs carrying out projects in areas where SDA activities have been implemented. It also included intensive review of some forty-five sub-project files, as well as project correspondence, internal USAID memoranda, reports, scopes of work, and the Project Evaluation prepared by Checchi and Company in 1988. The evaluation was conducted over a period of thirty days in November and December of 1993 and January 1994.

Visits were made to eleven sites in six geographical areas of Bolivia where sub-projects of the SDA have been carried out since June 1991. These visits included intensive interviews with project beneficiaries to determine the impact of sub-projects on their well-being. Interviews were also aimed at determining how sub-projects were selected and subsequently implemented to see if, in fact, these activities have contributed to USAID program objectives of improving the effectiveness of key democratic institutions and practices.

Approximately twelve days were spent interviewing out in the field, ten days reviewing the documentation and in interviews with USAID staff, and eight days writing the report and receiving and incorporating feedback from project staff. After the draft report had been prepared, an oral presentation was given to the Mission.

ANNEX C

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Inspection visits should be carried out, documents completed, and counterpart contributions verified, **before proposals** are sent to the Project Committee (USAID and Embassy) for selection approval.

2. Interaction between USAID and the Embassy should be focused on the selection of proposals and inauguration ceremonies. The committee to select proposals should meet several times a year.

3. Once a proposal is selected, the sub-obligating approval document should be signed by USAID officials including the Controller and the Director. Embassy signatures on this document **would not** be required, and USAID/DP would be responsible for managing the sub-projects to completion. Embassy personnel would continue to be invited to inaugurations.

4. If USAID technical assistance is to continue under the follow-on project, this should be so stated in the project paper. If technical assistance is reduced, then communities should be chosen which can carry out projects with minimal technical assistance.

5. In less developed communities, small, simple projects should be supported so that communities can carry out these projects with little outside assistance.

6. Direct interaction between communities and USAID is important so that beneficiaries are aware that SDA assistance comes from the U.S. Government. Activities which complement those being carried out by other organizations in an area should be supported to maximize project impact.

7. It is recommended that a computerized tracking system be set up for the follow-on project.

8. Planned counterpart host-country contribution for the follow-on project should not exceed 25% of the total grant.

9. Communication could be improved by scheduling regular meetings in which the Project Coordinator, Project Manager, and Chief of Development Programs discuss the status of project activities and any concerns.

10. The Project Manager should attend inaugurations at least twice a year.

ANNEX D

PERSONS AND INSTITUTIONS CONTACTED

PERSONS AND INSTITUTIONS CONTACTED

PROJECT BENEFICIARIES

JATUN KHASA

Constantino Choque. Director of the Agrarian Union.
Epifania Cruz. Student.
Julian Ledesma. Student.
Gregorio Vargas. Teacher.

ASANQUIRI

Francisco Condori. Director of the Agrarian Union.
Santiago Huaunale. Corrector of the Agrarian Union.

PARARANI

Teodoro Jala. Director of the Agrarian Union.

CHAUPISUYO

Gregorio Alcocer. Member, Agrarian Union.
Victor Altos. Member, Agrarian Union.
Felix Baes. Member, Agrarian Union.
Felipe Fernandez. Member, Agrarian Union.
Froilan Jugar. Member, Agrarian Union.
Lucio Laime. Member, Agrarian Union.
Santiago Lopez. Member, Agrarian Union.
Domesia Orellana. Member, Agrarian Union.
Lucio Orellano. Member, Agrarian Union.
Francisco Paredes. Member, Agrarian Union.
Ruben Pérez. Member, Agrarian Union.
Basilia vda. de Ugarte. Member, Agrarian Union.
Zacarías Vallejo. Member, Agrarian Union.
Felipe Lucio Vargas. Member, Agrarian Union.
Rómulo Merida Velazquez. Member, Agrarian Union.

CARRASCO

Victor Achacata. Ex Director, Agrarian Union.
Alejandro Galindo Pilancho. Beneficiary.
Carlos Melgar. Director, Agrarian Union.

RANCHO GRANDE

Alfredo Juaniquina. Health Promotor and resident.

CARMEN PAMPA

Hermano Danel Doherty. Priest and teacher.
Alfredo Gonzalez. Student.
Willy Huaqui Barrera. Student.

Patricia Mamani. Student.
Gregoria Nova. Student.
Andrés Pardo Asllani. Director.
José Leonel Vidal. Acting Administrator of Farm.
Lillian Zapata. Student.

CAMARON

Padre Miguel Donahuey - Priest of San Lorenzo Parish which is
                      responsible for Camerón.
Sira Arrollo de Aguilera. Beneficiary.
Rosa Eurdalina. Beneficiary.

OROZAS

Elfidio Sivila. Vice President of School Committee.
Adela Baldiviezo de Mendieta. Teacher.

CHURQUIS CENTRO

Ridder Flores. Teacher.
Aldo Gonzalez. Vice President, Water Committee.
Celso Torra. President, Water Committee.
Hernán Torres. Neighbor.
Pedro Vaca. Teacher.

TIKALA LINARES, COLLANA, BETANZOS

Daniel Aricoma. Resident.
Dionisio Patricio. Resident.
Teófilo Salvador. Resident.
Asencia Billa. Resident.
Santiago Flores. Resident.

CANSAVE

Alex Condor Aramayo. Technician in Public Health.
Jose Luis Bedregal. Executive Director.
Carlos Chirveches. Technician/Agronomist.
Ivo Terrazas. Technician/Constructor.

CARITAS, TRINIDAD

Vilma Lopez Ibañez. Nurse.
Juan Ramón Takata Zurita, Manager.

CEDIBENI

Tanya Melgar, Executive Director.

CIFEMA

Jaime Mendoza. Director.

Leonardo Zambrana. Mechanical Engineer.

CIPCA CENTRO DE PROMOCION PARA CAMPESINOS

Bernardo Solis. Agronomist.

FEPADE FUNDACION ECUMENICA PARA EL DESARROLLO

Rodrigo Aramayo. Executive Director.

GTZ

Wladimar Sanchez. In charge of wells.
Carlos Velasco. Agronomist.
Raúl Zelada.

INEDER INSTITUTO DE EDUCACION PARA EL DESARROLLO RURAL

Jaime Rocha. Engineer/Agronomist.

PEACE CORPS BOLIVIA

Christine Carley. Volunteer working with Project Concern in Oruro.
Michael Eschleman. Deputy Director of Peace Corps in Bolivia.

PDAR PROGRAMA DE DESARROLLO ALTERNATIVO

Remberto Revollo. Engineer in charge of Capinota Brigade.

USAID/BOLIVIA

Marcos Arce. SDA Project Coordinator, DP.
Edmundo Ballivian. Financial Analyst, Controller's Office.
Lorenzo Di Coste. Deputy Coordinator, DI.
Hector Diez de Medina. SDA Project Manager, DP.
Robert Kahn. Deputy Program Officer, DP. (Formerly managed SDA
              project in Fiji.)
Maria Antonieta Iturri. Technical Accountant.
Carl Leonard. USAID Director.
Raquel Peñaloza. Deputy Chief Accountant
Willy Peñeranda. Chief Accountant.
Jack Sleeper. Deputy Chief, ARD. (Formerly managed SDA project in
              Granada.)
Steve Smith. Deputy Chief. Trade and Investiment Office.
Gene Szepezy. Program Officer. Chief of DP.
Angel Vasquez. In charge of PL 480 Title III Program which
              finances self-help projects under USAID projects
              (i.e. CORDEP).

ANNEX E

SCOPE OF WORK

SCOPE OF WORK FOR THE FINAL EVALUATION OF THE SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES PROJECT No. 511-0623

I. BACKGROUND

The goal of the **Special Development Activities Project (SDA)** is to contribute to the improvement of socio-economic conditions of rural communities, preferably in remote areas of Bolivia, where there is no assistance from the Bolivian government. The project contributes to the improvement of the effectiveness and accessibility of key democratic institutions through enhancing the participation of rural communities in the decision-making process. Accordingly, it contributes to the Mission strategic objective of improving the effectiveness of key democratic institutions and practices.

The purpose of the SDA project is to assist small rural communities and local organizations to undertake self-help projects which have an immediate impact on the communities' social and economic welfare. The SDA provides up to $10,000 to each approved project.

The project was authorized for $500,000 on 6/25/91 and the project assistance completion date (PACD) is 9/30/95 with a life of project (LOP) of fifty-one months. The End of Project Status (EOPS) includes sixty-five completed sub-projects: thirty-five in water, sanitation, and health; fifteen in education; and fifteen income generating projects.

The sub-project approval process as described in the Project Paper includes the following steps:

1. Requests are received from communities and local organizations throughout the country.

2. Requests are reviewed by the Project Coordinator to ascertain whether they fit project parameters.

3. A site inspection is made by the Project Coordinator and the community's needs are verified.

4. An application form is submitted by the community to the Project coordinator. This application verifies the ability to provide community counterpart funds. According to the Project Paper, since these are self-help projects, the community should contribute a minimum of 40% (including in-kind contributions) to the total cost of the project.

5.   The Project Coordinator prepares a project outline and approval recommendation report.

6.   The outline and recommendation report are submitted to the joint USAID/Embassy Approval Committee for consideration and final approval.

To date, forty-five projects (one of these was a dual project assigned two numbers by Controller's) have been approved and thirty-two have been completed. The value of the approved projects is $296,934 with $111,684 corresponding to local counterpart and $185,250 to USAID funds. It is expected that by June 1994 all USAID/Bolivia project funds will have been committed on project approvals and staff support necessary for implementation. A Concept Paper for a follow-on SDA project has been sent to Washington and a new project is expected to begin during the current fiscal year.

II. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the impact of project activities and the effectiveness of implementation processes and strategies. Findings and recommendations from this evaluation will feed into the design of the new follow-on project which is expected.

The final evaluation has the following objectives:

A.   to assess whether or not project activities have fulfilled the goal and purpose of the project;

B.   to assess the extent to which project activities contribute to program strategic objectives;

C.   to assess the effectiveness of the project implementation process and to recommend how this could be improved;

D.   to determine the impact of project activities on its beneficiaries and on the communities in which they are carried-out.

III. SCOPE OF WORK

A. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluator will answer questions which cover the areas addressed in the evaluation objectives:

- **goal and purpose**
- **program objectives**
- **implementation effectiveness**
- **project impact**

c. What are the roles of the **Project Coordinator** and **Project Manager** in project implementation and how could the implementation tasks of these people be improved to increase efficiency?

d. How does the project monitoring and follow-up system function? How many site visits to sub-projects usually occur during project implementation? Estimate the cost of supervising a typical project? Describe the financial monitoring process and make recommendations for the follow-on project.

e. Is the project tracking system adequate and has it been incorporated into the LAN system? Are adequate monitoring indicators currently in use and how could they be improved?

f. Are the three categories of sub-projects (1. water, sanitation, and health; 2. education; 3. income generation;) the most adequate or should other types of projects be allowed?

4. **Project Impact**

a. How is project impact currently measured? Are impact data collected on a regular basis and is there gender information?

b. What is the status of the current project EOPS what is an appropriate number of sub-projects for a project with this level of funding and LOP?

c. What is the estimated number of beneficiaries and what has been the impact of the sub-projects on their well-being?

B. **WRITTEN REPORT**

1. **Format**

   The evaluator will submit a written report which should contain the following:

   a. AID Evaluation Summary Form 1330-5

   b. The evaluation report should not exceed 30 pages and should include the following sections:

Specific questions to be answered in the evaluation are as follows:

1. **Goal and purpose**

a. Are the sub-projects contributing to an improvement in the socio-economic conditions of the rural communities where they are being carried-out?

b. Are there other sources of assistance in the beneficiary communities? What are they and do they include the Bolivian government?

c. Do these sub-projects have immediate impact on the welfare of the beneficiaries living in the communities?

d. Are these self-help projects and are counterpart contributions forthcoming in a timely manner?

e. What are appropriate assumptions for the logframe of the follow-on project?

f. What indicators and procedures are used to measure the developmental impact of the sub-projects and are they adequate?

2. **Program Objectives**

a. Describe the decision-making process through which the community determines sub-projects. Who participates in the process and is it democratic?

b. Does this project contribute to strengthening democracy at the community level, and if so, how?

3. **Implementation Effectiveness**

a. Describe the sub-project approval process as it is currently carried out under the SDA project. Is it the same as that identified in the Project Paper? Is it efficient and timely and what changes are recommended for improving it?

b. How are prospective sub-projects currently identified? What is the interaction between USAID/Bolivia and the Embassy in project identification?

- an executive summary;

- a discussion of findings, conclusions and recommendations for each of the four areas evaluated;

- a discussion of lessons learned.

- an Appendices section which will include at a minimum, the following:

- a brief summary of the current status of outputs;
- a description of the methodology used in the evaluation;
- a bibliography of documents consulted;
- a list of institutions and individuals consulted;
- summary of recommendations.

2. Submission of the Report

The evaluator will make an oral presentation to the USAID/Bolivia staff before the final report is submitted. A draft report will be submitted to the USAID/B Development Program Office and other interested individuals. The final written report will incorporate Mission comments. Ten copies of the report in English will be submitted.

C. LEVEL OF EFFORT

Approximately thirty days will be required for one specialist to carry out this evaluation. These days will be spent as follows:

10 days to review project documentation and to discuss the project in USAID/Bolivia and in the Embassy;

12 days travel within Bolivia to visit sub-project sites, interview beneficiaries, and assess impact;

5 days to write the draft report and prepare for the oral presentation;

3 days to collect feedback and incorporate it into the final report.